



HE (who had reported to Master *Williams*, *Whittingham*, *Gilby*, and others, that *Cranmer* Bishop of *Canterbury*, had drawn up a Book of *Prayer*, *an hundred times more perfect then this* that we now have; the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a *wicked Clergy* and *Convocation*, with other enemies) even he, I say stood in this, that Master *Bullinger* did like well of the *English* order, and had it in his *Study*. But when *Whittingham* had demanded that question, *Bullinger* told him, that indeed Master *H.* and Master *C.* asked his judgement concerning certain points of that Book, as *Surplice*, *Private Baptism*, *Churching of Women*, the *Ring in Marriage*, with such like, which (as he said) he allowed not, and that *he neither could if he would, neither would if he might* use the same in his *Church*, whatsoever had been reported. *History of the troubles at Frankeford first published 1575. in the 42. 43. pag.*

3

A
SOBER and TEMPERATE
DISCOURSE,
Concerning the Interest of
Words in Prayer,
The just Antiquity and Pedigree of
LITURGIES,
OR
Forms of Prayer in Churches:
With a View of the State of the Church, when they
were first composed, or imposed.

Together with

A Discovery of the weakness of the grounds upon which they were first brought in, or upon which Bishop *Gawden* hath lately Discoursed, the necessity of a *Liturgie*, or the inconveniency of altering the *English Liturgie*, the utility of *Church Musick*, and the lawfulness of *Ceremonies*: in which are mixed *Reasons* justifying those Godly *Ministers*, who forbear the use of the *Common-prayer*, against the late *Out-cries* of the said *Bishop*.

By H. D. M. A.

1 Pet. 3. 9. *Not rendring evil for evil, or, railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you should inherit a blessing.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. A. and are to be sold at the Royal Exchange, & in *Pauls Church-yard*, 1667.

DISCOURSE

Words in Prayer

LITURGIES

With a View of the state of the Church, when they were first composed, or imposed.

A Discovery of the weakness of the grounds upon which they were first brought in, or upon which Bishop Combes hath lately Discontinued the necessity of a Liturgy, or the inconvenience of altering the English Liturgy, the utility of Church music, and the lawfulness of Communion: in which are mixed several justifying of the Liturgy, who likewise the use of the Communion, against the late out-cries of the said Bishop.

B. H. D. M. A.

1 Peter 2. 1. The living soul for ever, or rather for ever, the living soul, knowing that you are the saints called, you should inherit a blessing.

L O N D O N

Printed and sold by J. and J. W. at the Royal Exchange, in London.

1740



A Discourse of Lyturgies, or Forms of Prayer in Churches, &c.

CHAP. I.

The Interest of Words in Prayer considered, both as to private and publick Prayer; The Necessity of them considered, as the Homage of our Lips, as they restrain mentall extravagancies, and are Interpreters of our Conceptions to others: Consequences from this Consideration.

- I. **S**O transcendent is the priviledge of coming to the *Holy of Holies*, by the *new* and *living* way in the most sublime and spiritual duty of Prayer, where the soul talks with its Creator, as it were *face to face*. Such is the nature of that spiritual performance, considered in it self, so momentous the Concernes, for which in it we wait upon the Throne of Grace; so many the directions which our *Holy Father* hath given us in his Word for the acceptable performance of it, that we must needs be concluded *unthankful* to God, who hath indulged so glorious a Liberty to us, *unjust* and *unreasonable* to our selves, who are by the Law of Nature taught to
- B
- remit

remit or intend our minds in all performances, according to the moment of them, and *unfaithful* to that Word, which we own as the square of all our Conversations, if we should not warily attend our Souls in so Sacred an Homage, in which so much of our Interest lies, *not offering a Female, when we have a Male in our Flock*; though we knew of no such Malediction as that, *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently.*

II. Whilst we view this sacred thing *Prayer*, as our *Priviledge*, we can consider it no otherwise than as a Liberty, to ask of the Father of mercies, *what we or others stand in need of*, under the encouragements of many precious Promises, not short of his who said, *Ask what thou wilt, even to the half of my Kingdom, I will give it thee*; yea far beyond; for *the Lord will give Grace and Glory*, Psal. 84. When we respect it as our duty, we find it is expressed in Scripture under the many notions of *Seeking God, Calling upon him, wrestling with him, pouring out our souls before him, &c.* As our view of it in the notion of a priviledge, forbids us any *limitations*, as to the *matter of our Prayers*, other than what God hath set us; so the latter obligeth us to a performance of it under such *Circumstances*, as shall neither divert the *intention of our mind*, nor cool the *fervour of our Spirits*, which two things are most essentially necessary to the acceptable performance of our duty in it, and so excellently becomes that most sacred performance; and without which our performance is but *lip-labour*, and *lost labour*; yea no other than a most gross *Hypocrisie*, and *mocking of him who cannot be mocked.*

III. Prayer being the souls *Colloquy with God*, who is a Spirit, and our Tongue (which is the Organ of speech) with all the faculty belonging to it, and the issues of it, serving chiefly (if not only) for *intercourse with men* (Spirits having another way to communicate their sense each to other) It is rationally apparent that there is no absolute necessity of any *words at all in Prayer*. (*Hannah* can pray acceptably, and yet her voice not be heard, *1 Sam. 1.*) for such necessity must either be on the *Souls part* or on *Gods*: On the Souls part they are not necessary, for it can long and desire without the Tongue; nor yet on Gods part are they so, for he not only knows what things we have need of, but also what we would have before we ask them; how else can he answer before we call, and (as he promiseth) *hear before we speak.*

IV. But he who made all things for himself, did not in that general design except the Tongue of man, which being his creature, is naturally

naturally obliged, and *ex Instituto*, is otherwise obliged to his Service, and as his Word hath directed its service in other things, so also in the duty of *Prayer*, commanding us to *take unto us words, and say*, &c. And calling to his Spouse, *Let me hear thy voice, for it is comely*; And his *Providence* hath for this end (amongst others) disposed reasonable souls into humane bodies, that they should animate the tongues of men to this sacred Service: Besides that, *experience* teacheth the Sons of men that the use of the *lively voice* is of excellent use to *fix the mind*, and to restrain that wild thing from such wanton diversions, as it is most prone to, in its exercises upon God: Whence it is that there is not only *Mental*, but *Vocal* Prayer, and both the unquestionable duty of Christians; and an *use of words in Prayer* is, if not at all times, yet at some times, and for all Christians, necessary by a *necessity of Precept*, and highly *expedient* generally even in the Souls *privatest* converse with God.

V. But in *Publick Prayer*, the use of words is most *unquestionably necessary*: God hath not only allowed us a liberty to pray for our selves, and in our *Closets*, but also to *pray one with and for another*, and also enjoined us it as our duty, and encouraged us to it by many gracious Promises. It is *his revealed will*, that in such publick devotions, some particular persons should be the mouth of the rest unto him, whose Prayer (according to divine Institution) is made the common performance of the whole Society (whether it be that of a whole Family, or that of a greater or lesser Congregation) by their *concurrence in spirit* with him that speaketh, and their *rational and fiducial assent* to what he speaketh, as well on theirs, as his own behalf. Now there being no other ordinary way of correspondence which God hath allowed rational souls each with other (in their united estate) but by the tongues of men, animated by the souls to that very purpose, that they might be their Interpreters. It is impossible that publick Prayer should be performed without words, and those both *audibly* and *intelligibly* pronounced, which is also conformable to the *will of God*, who hath taught us when we pray, to say *Our Father*: Whence it appears, that both the silent, *mute* Meetings of *Quakers*, and the *Latine Service* of *Papists*, and the Prayers of any others *said or sang*, so that People cannot hear or understand what is said, are all of the *abominable* in the sight of God, and to be abhorred of every reasonable Christian.

VI. But seeing words are no more than the desires of our souls interpreted. And there being no further use of them in the duty of Prayer, than that by them we might sacrifice unto God the devotion of our hearts by the Calves of our lips. 2. And by the help of them we might interpret the (otherwise not intelligible) desires of our souls unto others. And 3. Retrain the extravagancies of our own Spirits: A Curiosity of phrase in Prayer, seems neither necessary nor reasonable. Not necessary, because as our holy Father who understands the thoughts of our hearts, before they be brought forth into words, hath no need of well turn'd Language to affect his sacred ears, nor hath required more than according to the ability, which he hath given to several souls: So the plainest phrase is best intelligible to the most of those that hear us, who are to give a rational assent, and say a fiduciary Amen to what we speak.

VII. Nor are the Prayers of the poorest Rustick (who ordinarily salutes his neighbour and expresseth his mind to him in terms which the Critick calls *Nonsense*) for their *Grammatical incongruities or defects in Rhetorick*, less acceptable unto God than the lofty strains and luxuriant issue of wanton Rhetorick in the prayers of others are, whose great study possibly is to put their prayers into handfom Language. Who knows not that many *Idiomes* in other Languages are perfect *nonsense* in English? Yet who doubts but God accepteth in every Nation pious souls, powring out their hearts unto him in Prayer, by their mouths, according to the Dialects of their several Countries.

VIII. In very deed, the only *Nonsense* that can attend Prayer, is the *incongruity of the tongue of him that speaketh with his mind and heart, or with the understandings of those who joyn with him*. Let but the tongue be the true interpreter of the heart towards God, and the expressions of it be commensurate with the capacity and understanding of those that hear, and the Prayer shall be discharged from any guilt of *Nonsense* in the sight of God, accruing from a want of *Grammatical order* in words (unless such want proceed from the Speakers *non-attention* and *carelessness* of his Spirit) Yea the Prayer which the wanton Orator, the curious observer of words, and Pryer into the proprieties of them, may call *Non-sense*, may be most admirable sense in the ears and judgment of God and good men, whose eye is upon higher things in spiritual duties, than a well tuned esse posse videatur.

IX. Yea

IX. Yea there may be in him that speaketh, such an affectation of *nitid words* and *curious phrases*, such a superlative care, that *Noun Substantives* and *Adjectives* may stand in due places, and *Verbs* be put in right *Moods* and *Tenses*, that too many *monosyllables* or *pollysyllables* may not hobble or rumble after one another, such a study for *paronomasia's* and other *Fooeries of phrase*, as may make the Prayer abominable both to God and to all good men: Whilst not the holy Omniscient God only, but even sober men easily discern the heart of him that speaketh, as to its *secret intention*, gone a *whoring from God* (to whom it should be united in Prayer) after that *Strumpet Rhetorick* in which he never took any delight. Nor is the Prayer (thus patched and painted and disguised by this Taylor-like art of words) understood by those who would better know it, and to whom it would appear far more lovely in the *morning-dress*, of a homebred, natural unaffected phrase.

X. Yet in regard that it cannot be reasonably presumed, that any *publick Congregation* should be made up of persons equally intelligent, in the mysteries of Godliness, nor equally intelligent of words and phrases, nor equally considering that words are but the shell and skin of Prayer. Nor so, but that there will be many amongst them of carnal hearts; it is very reasonable that he who speaks in publick Prayer, should so speak, that whilst he humbleth his phrase to the meanest capacity and understanding (that his Prayer may not lose their *Amen*) he also *elevates his words*, above the *nauseam* and *just reproach*, of the most *squeamish ears*, even of those who far more regard the *starching* of the Prayer, that it be pull'd right in every corner, and round about, than the matter of which it is composed, or the fervency of heart with which it is uttered.

XI. And doubtless who so in this thing keeps a *due mediocrity*, in the publick performance of the duty of Prayer, neither by too much *curiosity of phrase*, and *attention to that*, diverting his soul from the more serious and fixed *contemplation of God*, nor by mixing too much of *mans dung*, as *Luther* calls it (alluding to that of *Ezechiel*) with *spiritual bread*, makes the duty a loathing to spiritual souls: Nor yet by too much *rudeness*, and *carelessness of phrase*, shall either give a just suspicion to others, that his heart attends not what his Tongue speaks, or offers a temptation to the more carnal part of his Hearers, to loath and condemn the Service, hath sufficiently discharged his duty, and needs be no further careful of words

words in Prayer, unless (which it may be is not impossible) he can find out or invent some *modes* and *forms of expressions*, which upon the evidence of experience shall appear to be more proper means, than the use of other words, to warm the hearts of those that are to joyn with him, and to boyl them up to a greater degree of *feruency in spirit*, whilst they are in that duty serving the Lord. To which purpose, handsom *cadencies of periods*, a *lofty rousing stile*, affected *Paranomasia's*, pedantick *quibblings of words and phrases*, (fine Knacks to please childish ears with) are so far from signifying any thing, that they are *cujus contrarium's* in the business, good for nothing but to loath pious souls. And indeed, those *phrases* which do this excellent deed, are experimentally found to be such as the inwardly affected heart of the Speaker immediatly dictates to his Tongue. It being most undoubtedly truth, That words coming from the heart of the Speaker, find the nearest and readiest way to the heart of the Hearer; and the Souls of the hearers shall acknowledge themselves most affected, when the Speaker finds *his heart* most warmed and enlarged, as if there were a *Sympathy of devout Souls*, which is indeed from the mighty secret working of the same spirit of Prayer acting both and at the same time preparing the Speakers heart and tongue to dictate and speak, and the Hearers souls to hear, sigh, groan, and to give a fiducial assent, *Rom. 8. 26.*

CHAP. II.

The Gift of Prayer is partly Natural, partly by Industry acquirable. That it is promised by God, denied to none that will duely use means to attain it; but they may so far attain it, as in publick to pray without forms, so as God shall accept it, and none have just cause of Scandal. That none worthy of the Office of the Ministry, need to want it, nor do, but through their own Sin and Negligence.

- I. **T**HE Gift and Grace of Prayer are two things: The *Grace of Prayer* is a spiritual ability in the Soul, from which it is enabled from the *Spirit of Adoption* to go unto God saying *Abba, Father,*

Father, with an holy boldness, fiducial confidence, fervency of spirit, begging of him things according to his Will: This Nature doth not teach, Industry will not necessarily bring us to; for this God must send forth the spirit of his Son into peoples hearts, crying Abba Father, Gal.4.6. And none can do this but those who have received the Spirit of Adoption, Rom.8.15. But the gift of Prayer is nothing else, but an ability of mind to form words, expressive of such desires of our hearts, as are according to the will of God, conjoynd with a faculty of memory, and of expression and elocution.

II. Hence it appears, that the gift of Prayer is partly natural; for from nature is the faculty of Meditation and Speech: partly by Industry attainable; For let us duly consider, what he hath to do that prayeth, more than to speak (that is in reference to the external part of Prayer, performable by the gift of Prayer) Prayer consisteth of a Confession of all sins, Supplications for supply of wants for our selves and others, and a thanksgiving for Mercies received. Sin is either Original or Actual: Actual sin is a transgression of the Law of God. This Law of God is contained in his Word; all violations of it in thought, word or deed are sins. Supposing a man in a capacity to meditate and speak what is wanting to any, save Industry only, why he should not compose a Confession of Sins? If he knows what the Scripture saith of the imputed guilt of Adams sin, of our being conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity. What the Law of God requires and forbids, and considereth his own and other mens words and actions, and his own heart, to which other mens hearts answer in a great measure, why should he not be able to form a Confession in his heart, and (if he have any elocution) to speak it with his Lips? And if he hath any habit of knowledge of the Scriptures as to these things, why should he not be able to speak this Confession to God *ex tempore*, as well as a Lawyer shall speak in matter of Law, or a knowing Philosopher discourse Philosophical Learning rationally, many times to the admiration of his Hearers?

It is further reasonable, that to a Confession of sins, should be added, an acknowledgment of the Justice of God in case of any Judgments already brought upon us or others, or upon supposition if God should bring upon us any. Surely every Christian knoweth, or should know, that the wages of sin is death, that the least sin exposeth us to the wrath of God here and hereafter, &c. And if he hath a tongue to speak, can say so to God in Prayer. In the
suppli-

supplicatory part of Prayer, we deprecate Judgment, we implore Mercy, for our selves, for others, for souls, for bodies, all according to the Will of God; who so knows he hath a Body and a soul, and knows the wants of both, knows what to ask for; and he that knows the Scriptures, is advantaged in that knowledge, and further is by them directed, what to ask for *absolutely*, what *conditionally*, what *Promises to urge* upon God in Prayer, what *Judgments to deprecate*, and in what *manner*: Nor is any so ignorant, as not to know what is good for himself or others in a natural sense; the Scripture tels him what is so *spiritually* and *truly*, and if he hath a tongue, he can surely say, *O God, I thank thee for*, &c. Doth he want Expressions? The Scripture is full of Expressions directive of him.

III. In short, (setting *Elocution aside*.) now that the Word of God is in our own Language, there can be nothing but particular Christians horrible neglect of acquainting themselves with it, or their *non-observing* their own hearts, or not using themselves to the *exercise of Prayer*, that can hinder any private Christian from being able to speak unto God in Prayer, fully, profitably acceptably, and so as none but prophane hearts shall be scandalized. And this Assertion is demonstrable.

Rom. 8 26.

Luke 11.

Mark 13.11.

IV. Besides this, God hath promised the help of *his Spirit as to words and matter* (in the use of means) the *Spirit shall teach us what to pray for*; nor is this beneath the *Holy Spirit* any more than to give unto suffering Saints *what to speak in the very hour they shall be called before men for Christs sake*; for which there is a Promise, and they allowed therefore to *take no care what to speak before-hand*. We acknowledge that the *Gift of Prayer* is no special distinguishing Gift, but a *common Gift*; but by no means can allow our selves in the suppressing of it.

V. Hence it is that many a person whose constant employment is not in the work of the Ministry, is able to *pour out his soul in Prayer* before God, in proper and apt expressions, without any further premeditation than is necessary, to take the noise of his worldly business out of his head, so *orderly* and *methodically*, and in such *handsom expressions*, that any godly sober Divine, though never so *Learned*, shall approve his performance, and bless God on his behalf.

VI. That any owning the *Name of a Minister of the Gospel*, should not be so able, is a great reproach to our Church, considering

Stobor

ing that this disability must proceed, 1. From a want of knowledge in the Scriptures, (which every Minister ought to know exactly.) Or, 2. From a want of a due observance to, and a watchfulness upon his own heart and waies (whereas he ought to excel others in the practical part of Holiness) Or, 3. From want of Elocution or freedom of speech, or such other natural gifts, without which none can judge himself called of God to that holy Employment. Or, 4. From want of exercising himself in the duty of Prayer: All which are lamentable things for any professing himself a Minister, so much as to be suspected of.

VII. Yet that *de facto*, there have been such called by the name of *Ministers*, amongst us, and that there are many such amongst us still, cannot be reasonably denied: But we dare to assert, That all such are either such as for want of *Natural Parts*, are by all *Scriptural Rules* determined insufficient, and not fit for the Ministry, or such, as according to all *Scriptural* and *Ecclesiastical Rules* ought to be removed from the Ministry, as neglecting to use the Gift of God bestowed on them, or neglecting to study the Scriptures, or such as live in open and known courses of Debauchery, or finally, such as have so used themselves to the lazy Devotion of *Book Prayers*, that they have choaked their abilities, or provoked God in righteous Judgment to deprive them of them.

VIII. It yet remains a most demonstrable truth, that the work of Prayer is not such, as to the use of words in it, but that any Minister of any competent abilities, (as all Ministers ought to be) and who is in any reasonable degree acquainted with the holy Scriptures, and with any Christian diligence, either observeth his own heart, or peoples converses, and watcheth over his Flock but with half an eye, may so perform, as neither God shall be offended with his performance, nor any sober Auditor scandalized and made to nauseate the Duty. And it will (upon experience) be found impossible for any State or Church to maintain (by imposing Forms of Prayer) the credit of any Ministry, whom the people shall discern so wofully neglective of their duty, and defective in so noble a performance, in which they are excelled by the meanest of the *Vulgar*. There being no other way (when all is tried) to maintain the Authority of the Ministry, than the employment of such, and only such persons in that work, who shall evidently appear to People, as to the Gifts and Graces of Gods Spirit bestowed upon them, to be taller by the Head and Shoulders than those are, over whom God hath set them.

them. Other Devices may be tried; this only in the end will be
found efficacious.

CHAP. III.

*The Original of Lyturgical Forms of Prayer. None for
400 years after Christ. None imposed upon any consi-
derable Part of the Church, till 800 years after Christ,
when all manner of Superstitious Usages had defiled the
Church.*

Duranti ratio-
nale, l. 5. c. 2.

I. **W**Hich being premised, it is no wonder at all, that nei-
ther *Christ* nor his *Purer Church* ever imposed upon the
Church any Books of *Lyturgies*. *Durantis* indeed tells us, That
Christ himself (who certainly had an infallible Spirit, and a pro-
portion of it without measure, if that may be called a proportion)
yet used that excellent *Form of Prayer*, called the *Lords Prayer* (by
which he taught his Disciples to pray; And that the Apostles
used the *Creed*, called (but never yet proved) theirs: But he
confesseth, that in *Primitivâ Ecclesiâ diversi diversa quisq; pro suo
velle cantabant, dummodo quod cantabant ad Dei Gloriam pertinebat.*
In the Primitive Church every one sang or prayed (for that he
called singing) as they pleased, so that what they all did, related to
the Glory of God. When *Christ* sent out his Disciples to preach,
he was so particular in directing them, that he takes care to direct
them to provide a *Purse* and a *Scrip*, but none for a *Service-Book*:
Nor did the Apostle *Paul* in his particular directions to *Timothy* or
Titus (whether they were *Evangelists* or *Bishops*) though he or-
dered them to ordain *Ministers*, and charge them to fulfil their
Office, by putting up *Prayers and Supplications* for all men, &c. so
much as mention any *Missal* or *Lyturgy* for their directions;
which it is strange they should have omitted, had *Lyturgies* been
so necessary, as we are now told they be, that Religion without
them cannot be preserved, nor *Heresies* without them re-
strained.

II. Those holy Servants of God knew, that the Spirit of Prayer
was poured out in the world, and that the gift of Prayer was one
of those gifts, which their Master when he ascended up on high did
give

Wholen

give unto men; and were tender of delivering ought to the Church, which they had not received from the Lord: And (which *Tertulian* said afterward) were willing that Ministers should pray *sine Monitore, quia de pectore*, without a Monitor (not a *Mummer*, as some would have it) because it was their duty to pray from their hearts; they therefore even in the Confession of our Adversaries, and the greatest Masters of the Ceremonies, left no *Lyturgies* for the Church of God.

III. Indeed *Claudianus de Saintes* and *Pamelius* (two Popish Divines) have discovered to the world the *Terra incognita* of certain *Lyturgies*, fathered upon St. *James*, St. *Peter* and St. *Mark*; which *Josephus Vicecomes* takes notice of (but doth not think fit to insist upon them.) Cardinal *Bellarmino* in his Book *de Scriptor. Eccles.* neither mentions that of *Peter* nor *Mark*, but brands all Books (not mentioned by him, attributed to St. *Peter*) with the names of *spurii & supposititii*. That of St. *James* indeed he mentioneth, but tels us that it is so basely augmented, that none can determine what of it was St. *James's*. But the Learned *Mornay* hath said enough to prove that these pretended *Lyturgies* of the *Apostles* were all Fictions, and it will be no hard matter to evince every sober Reader the truth of it. Who knows not how hard a thing the Bishops in the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Calcedon* found it to find a place or two in the Writings of the Ancients, where the *Virgin Mary* was called *θεοτόκος*? Where had the difficulty been if these *Lyturgies* had been in the world, and in *Proclus* his hand too (who was present in the Council of *Ephesus*) who they say, transmitted that of St. *James* to the world (for in that *Lyturgy* it is 5 or 6 times over: Nor certainly would the Members of the Synod of *Constantinople* have been at a loss to have proved out of this, the calling of the Holy Spirit *consubstantial with the Father*, had they ever seen this new invented Toy. Both in this, and St. *Marks Lyturgy* Christ is again and again called *θεος αληθινος* with his Father, which certainly would have determined this great Question about that Word in the *Nicene* and other Councils. Both in St. *James's* and St. *Marks Lyturgies* we have the *τελεγον* invented by *Felix 480*. To say nothing of the Notions of *Altars*, *Temples*, burning *Frankincense*, *Censers*, such as lived in *Monasteries*, *Confessors*, the Prayer for the *Pope*, In St. *Marks Lyturgy*, the Prayers for *Subdeacons*, *Readers*, *Singers*. All which things have made them justly rejected by all sober Writers, and accounted of no better

De Missa ap-
paratu. l. 7. c. 21

Bellarmino. De
Script. Eccl. de
Jac. Apostol.

authority than the *Epistles of Christ and Abagarus*; for the very mention of which, *Gelasius* of old, called *Eusebius* his *History Apochryphal*. Nor are those pretended to be *St. Peters* and *St. Matthews* of better authority. The same things are to be objected against the first, and surely if *St. Peters Vicar* thought better of it, the Church of *Rome* would have used it before that made by *Gregory* the Pope (which is that they use.) In that pretended to be *St. Matthews*, there is mention of the *Epact & Golden Number* (knacks invented long since) Prayers for *Popes, Patriarchs, Archbishops*, (persons *St. Matthew* never knew) Nay *Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory* the Great, the *Nicene Council* have their honourable mention in it, which were all 3, 4, 5 or 600 years after *St. Matthews* time. So that *Baronius* himself is ashamed of all, but that called *St. James's*, nor doth *Saintes* mention more. To say some things might be added, yet they might make *Lyturgies* of no value; 'tis that which *Bellarmin.* and *Baronius* have said, and some *Semi-Protestants* have taken up after them: For which they have no further proof than the Title of a Book set by a Popish Priest, which proves all as well as some.

IV. Nor is there any thing more clear to us than this, both from that of *Tertullian* (mentioned before) who lived *Anno 200* after *Christ*, and from that long since quoted by *Smectymnus*, out of *Eusebius*, That *Constantine* the Emperor made Prayers for his Army, which unquestionably he would not have done, had there been then any *Lyturgies* (especially any known by the Reverend authorities or Names of *Matthew, Mark, Peter, or James*. Besides that, Bishop *Hall* could pretend no higher authority than the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*. (of which more by and by) For any Pretences of any in the *Jewish Church*, they are perfect *Apochryphals*. What truth there may be in what *Vicomes* saith, that the Pagans had their *Service-Books*, to direct them in their idolatrous Service; which he proves out of *Cicero, Festus, Clem. Alexandr.* and *Lactantius*: We are not at leisure to enquire, nor think it much material; for surely Christians are to take no Copies from them.

V. The highest pretended Authority then for publick Lyturgies, is from the 18th Can. of the Council of *Laodicea*: What time that Council was celebrated, is not agreed. *Caranza* saith it was *Anno 364.* towards the latter end of the time of *Liberius* the Pope. *Longus* and *Baronius* (from whom he had it) dates it 315. under Pope

Agathangelus Pa-
ris. 1560.

Jos. Vicecomes
de Missæ appas-
satu. l. 7. c. 21.

De oblatione

Pope Sylvester; which he proves, because it was before the time of Basil and Theodoret, which are no Arguments (for Basil wrote not till near 380. nor Theodoret till Anno 420.) Balsamon (a man well enough skilled in the Chronology of the Gr. Councils) sets it after the Synod of Antioch, and next before that of Sardis. This Synod decrees τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν, (saith Balsamon) that the same *Liturgy of Prayers* should be used in the Morning and Evening: Suppose his a true Copy, every one knows, that λειτουργία εὐχῶν doth not necessarily signifie a Form of words in Prayer, but meerly an Order of Prayers: But besides this, Caranza gives this Canon another title, and phrase too: The Title, *De Oratioribus quotidianis*. The Canon, *De eo quod semper supplicationes orationum, & ad horam nonam & vesperam oportet celebrari*. According to him, (in which were but 22 Bishops, Longus saith 32.) This Synod only decreed that there should be constant Prayers at Nine in the Morning and in the Evening; nor that they should be the same Forms.

VI. Nor can we believe there were at this time any Forms of Prayer made, for all Ministers to use; because we find the Council of Carthage only imposing this, *That if any Minister made any Prayers for his use, he should not use them, till he had communicated them to his more able Brethren*: Whence we gather, that at that time, which was about 395, there were no Forms of Prayer imposed upon Ministers. Can. 23.

VII. In which we are the more confirmed by the 12th, Canon of the Council of Mela, (commonly called the Milevitane Council) held in Africa, under Aurelius the Archbishop, where (so far as their Jurisdiction reached) they restrain Ministers, to the use of such Prayers, as should be approved by the Synod, *ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum*: least any thing through ignorance or negligence should be vented against the Faith, the Doctrine of which was then woefully shaken by Pelagius, to condemn whose Errours, that Council (which was but a Provincial Synod of 60 Bishops) were convened.

VIII. We are not ignorant of the *Lyturgies* fathered upon Basil, Chrysostome, and Ambrose, a little before this time. Basil was made Bishop about the year 372. Chrysostome about the year 382. Ambrose about 381. But he must have more Faith to spare, than we have, who can either believe, that the *Lyturgies* published under

Morneus de
Missæ, l. 1. c. 6.

Erasm. Epist. in
Paraph. in
1 Cor.

der their names, are indeed theirs; or that they indeed imposed any. There are two fathered upon *Basil*, one printed 1569. translated by *Masius*. The Greek Copy is far more large than the Latine, and so differing one from another, that 'tis no hard thing to determine of their authority, as the Learned *Morney* hath done. For that of *Ambrose*, we have it not in his workes, *Erasmus*, *Perkins*, and others condemn, those two Prayers (which are found in his workes, preparing the Priest to celebrate Mass) as none of his; in which censure, *Robertus Cocus*, yea and some *Papists* agree with him. What Vouchers therefore the *Papists* have for that *Officium Ambrosianum*, which *Jacobus de Voragine*, in the Golden Legend, and *Durantis* in his *Rationale*, tell us a Tale about, we cannot tell. For that fathered upon *Chrysostome*, there are divers Copies of it, scarce any of them agreeing with one another. Let those who can think that so grave a man as *Chrysostome* could direct the Church to pray for Pope *Nicholas* who lived almost 500 years after *Chrysostome* was dead) or for the Victory of *Alexius*, (which was in a Battel fought 700 years after he was dead) or who can believe that such a confused Fardel of stufte could be made by so worthy a person, believe it was his if they will. We are the more confirmed in the contrary, by the latter craft of *Lyturgy-mongers*, in leaving out the Names of *Alexius* and *Nicholas*, in their latter printed Latine Copies, the Translation of which, they yet unwarily father upon *Erasmus*, who tels us, he did not think it like to be true that ever *Chrysostome* made it.

IX. To be short, When we find that *Josephus Vicecomes* (as superstitious as he was) can fetch no higher authority for *Lyturgies*, than *Arnobius*, who lived 306. *Athanasius* who flourished 330. *Hierom*, who lived 385. *Victor Uticensis*, who lived 480. nor any plain proof from any of these: Only some of these spoke of Books of the Christians, *ubi summus oratur Deus*; (so *Arnobius*) *Sacros Scripturarum Libros* (so *Athanasius*) *Liber Hymnorum & Mysteriorum*, so *Hierom*. *Libros cunctos Domini*, (so *Uticensis*) We cannot but conclude, that at this time there were no *Service-Books* made, directing Forms of Prayer, though possibly *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, and others might write some Prayers to help some weak Christians which they might transcribe.

X. But what need we any further Testimony than is given, by *Duranti Rationale*, one as zealous for *Lyturgies*, *Rituals* and other *Ceremonies*, as ever lived in the world? it is that of *Durantis* in his *Rationale Divino-*

rum Officiorum, l. 5. c. 1. *Duramus* having ingeniously confessed (what none can without great impudence deny) that neither Christ nor his Apostles used any prescribed Forms but the *Lords Prayer* and the *Creed* (nor doth or can he or any other say a word to prove they used them) tells us that in succeeding times because the Church was rent by Heresies, *Theodosius* (who lived about the year 380) intreated Pope *Damasus*, "That some Ecclesiastical Office (or Lyurgy as we call it) might be made by some Ecclesiastical Catholic person, upon which Pope *Damasus* commanded *Hierom*, who was then in *Bethlehem* with *Paula Eustochium*, and other Virgins, to abide there, and make a Lyurgy for the Churches, because he was well skill'd in Hebrew, Greek, Chaldee and Latine; which he obediently did. He appointed how much of the Psalms should be read each day in the week, he also ordered the reading of the Gospels and Epistles out of the Old and New Testament: When he had done it, he sent it to Rome; it was approved by Pope *Damasus*, and made a Rule; and *Damasus* had the honour of the work, because it was done at his Command. *Gelasius* (who lived 490. and was Pope) and *Gregorius Magnus* (who lived 600 years after Christ) added Prayers and Songs, the Lessons and the Gospels. *Ambrose*, *Gelasius* and *Gregory* (saith he) added the *Gradualia*, *Tractus*, *Alleluiah*, other Doctors of the Church added other parts. — Thus far *Duramus*.

XI. He fetcheth the Original of *Lyurgies* from *Theodosius*; but how probably, let the Reader judge, who shall consider, that this good Emperor, was Emperor but 17 years; that in that time he convened that great and venerable Council of *Constantinople*, where were 150 worthy persons: Now let any judge how probable it was that this Emperor should never propose the business to these; (for their *Canons* are only about grave and necessary things) and send to Pope *Damasus* about this: He was a man too much acquainted with the efficacy of fervent Prayer, to restrain it. Nor indeed doth *Duramus* say, that he caused any Prayers to be made, all that he saith *Hierom* did, was the appointing an Order of reading the Scriptures.

XII. We must therefore go a little further than *Theodosius* his time. *Nuda ab initio omnia & simpliciter, Mysteria a Christo tradita apud Apostolos erant*, &c. (saith *Polydore Virgil*) One Pope after this time brought in one piece of the *Lyurgy*, another brought in another..

De Inventor.
cerum. l. 5. c. 11.

another. *Caelestinus* brought in the *Introitus Missæ*, *Damasus* the Confession, *Gregory* the Responds; and indeed till *Gregories* time there was no considerable use of it, nor any imposing of it. This was near upon 600 years after Christ.

XIII. Pope *Gregory* is usually said to be the worst of all the Bishops of Rome that preceded him, though the best of those that followed him; a man of no great Learning, for he confesseth himself (in one of his Epistles, that he understood no Greek) not blameless for *Morals*, (for he was accused before *Mauritius* the Emperor for the murder of one *Malchus*) Indeed the Protestant Writers make good use of him, for his Testimony, about some Points, viz. that about the Scriptures, Images, but chiefly in the question about the Head of the

Ep. 1.7. c. 194. Church.

XIV. The truth of the Story is, Two great Councils having before determined the Patriarch of *Constantinople* and the Bishop of Rome equal, only allowing to the latter the empty Title of the Bishop of the first Seat. *John*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* was not able to endure that, and so upon the Point, though both refused the Title, yet both strove to act the part of an Universal Bishop: The Patriarch had the advantage of *Gregory*, because (the Empire being then in the East) the Emperors Seat was at *Constantinople*: which caused divers Epistles between *Mauritius* and *Gregory*, (yet extant in *Gregories* workes) *Mauritius* in the heat of this Contest, was basely murdered by *Phocas* (one of his Captains) who was by the Souldiers made Emperor. *Gregory* (tending the Interest of his Sea) writes a most unworthy Letter to the Empress, fawning upon that vile Murderer, and beseeching him to favour St. *Peters* Successor, and to remember who said, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*: Soon after this, *Gregory* dies; but before he died, he had made a *Lyturgy*, (if we may believe *Pamelius*, he made a *Lectionary* or *Calendar*, directing Scriptures to be read in order, an *Antiphonary*, directing the Responds for Priests and People, and an *Order for administering the Sacraments*) Others think the two latter were made after; but however, these reached no further than *Gregories* power, the Extent of which was at this time but short and narrow.

15. *Sabinianus* was Pope immediatly after *Gregory*, he lived but six Moneths; *Boniface* succeeded him, he also fell in with *Phocas*, the Murderer of his Master: and the Patriarch of *Constantinople* being now out of favour with *Phocas*, because he could not flatter

ter

Greg. ep. 14.
Ep. 75 76.

v. Greg. Epist.
1. 11. c. 36, 43,
44.

ter him in his horrid wickednesses and cruelties, *Phocas* deserts him, and gives *Boniface* (what he asked) the Title of *Universal Bishop*: This was about the year 605. And now he might pretend some authority to impose his Service-Book.

XVI. But yet he did little (except in *Germany*) for the *Lombards* continual quarrels with the *Emperors*, till the year 800. much hindered the *Popes* power all that time, they lay close at home, all this while increased in Superstition, and the foolishness and ignorance of their Clergy increased, but in Jurisdiction they did little: Only taking advantages, one while favouring the *Emperors*, other while the *Lombards*; they added (by the favour of both) to *St. Peters* Patrimony, by all wicked acts imaginable, to be read at large in *Mornayes Mysterium Iniquitatis*, and in many other Books.

XVII. But about the year 800. *Charles* the Great, being come to the Empire (who was a vertuous and noble Prince, only highly addicted to the Sea of *Rome*) *Adrian* was then *Pope*, the Emperor was a great Favourer of him, he confirmed to him all the temporal Possessions which the *Popes* had got either from former *Emperors*, or from the *Commanders* of the *Lombards*, and added much more, which his Son *Ludovicus Pius* confirmed. This Emperor also settled the civil differences which had a long time troubled the Empire, and he had a vast empire; it contained *Italy*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, *France*, and part of *Spain*.

XVIII. Now it grew a seasonable time to impose a *Liturgy*; to which purpose, *Hadrian* the *Pope* moved *Charles* the Great, that it might be by his civil authority imposed; *Gregories* *Liturgy* was it, saith *Durantis*. *Ad quod Carolus Imperator omnes Clericos Minis & Supplicis per diversas Provincias cogebat Libros Ambrosiani Officii comburens, i. e.* To which *Charles* the Great compelled all his *Ministers* with threats and punishments; and burning those Books that went under the name of *St. Ambrose*. The Learned *Morney* saith the same almost, where we only observe, That the first imposing of a *Liturgy* was importuned by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and done in favour to him, in *Adriani gratiam*, (saith *Morney*) and began with a persecution. but the *Universal Bishop* must give the *Catholick Church* a cast of his Office, and impose a *Liturgy* as far as he could.

XIX. But after this, there was no small contest; one *Eugenius* comes and complains to *Pope Hadrian*, concerning the imposing

Duranti ratione, l. 5. c. 2.
Mornei Hist. Papatus, p. 141. fol.

*It were worth
the while to
know by what
book they prai-
ed in the
mean time.

Jacobus de Vo-
rag. Leg. aurea
in vita Greg.
Durantus ib.
Fox Martyrol.
Vol. 1.

of *Gregories Lyurgy* (it seems he liked that of *St. Ambrose*, i. e. said to be his) better. *Durantus* saith his importunity caused some *Holy Fathers* newly broke up from a Council, to meet again, who to determine this difference, reverently and unanimously agreed that both the *Service-Book* which was made by *St. Ambrose*, and that also made by *Gregory*, should be laid on *St. Peters Altar*, sealed up with the Seals of many Bishops, and the Church-doors should be shut, and the *Fathers* should spend the whole night in *Prayer, desiring God by some sign to determine, which of those *Service-Books* he would have to be used *universally*: It was done accordingly. In the Morning they go in, and find that of *St. Ambrose* lying in its place, that of *St. Gregory* torn in pieces, and scattered all about. (*If it be a Lye, Reader, thou hast it as cheap as we, and maiest read it in the Golden Legend, Durantus and Mr. Fox his Martyrology, and doubtless in many other places, but in those three we have read it.*)

XX. But now what do the Fathers determine upon this Miracle? We should have concluded, That it was the Will of God that *Gregories Service-Book* being full of all manner of superstitious Trash, should never be used, nor *St. Ambrose's* imposed, only lie by to be used in that Church if the Parson pleased. But (saith *Durantus*) they concluded this a sign from Heaven, that *Greg. Service-Book* or *Mis-sal* should be scattered abroad, and used in all Churches, and that of *St. Ambrose* only used in his own Church. (The business was, *Gregory* had been Pope, but *Ambrose* had not.) Accordingly Pope *Hadrian* moving the Emperor *Charles*, *Gregories Service-Book* was now imposed upon all Churches in *France, Hungary, Italy, Germany*, and in *England* too, for here 60 years before this, viz. Anno 740. *Ina* had subjected his Kingdom to Pope *Gregory*.

XXI. By, or before this time, the whole Fardel of Popish ceremonies and superstitions were brought into the Church, nothing wanting (saith the Learned *Morney*) but the worshipping of Images, (which *Charles* the Great alwaies opposed and wrote against, yet this also was about this time decreed by the Second Council of *Nice*, which *Caranza* saith, was celebrated, Anno 781. under *Adrian*) and Transubstantiation, for which the way was now prepared too; for at this time the Lords Supper was called the Sacrifice of the Mass, (saith *Morney*;) And he who reads the Ecclesiastical History of the *Magdeburgenses*, will find, that all the trash of Ceremonies and all manner of superstitious usages were now come into the

the Church. *Gregory* almost 200 years before had defended *Purgatory*, and was indeed (as *Alstedius* calls him) the *Master of the ceremonies*, he who defiled the Church with all manner of gross and abominable Superstition.

XXII. Now from this time, which was about the year 800, till the beginning of *Reformation*, which was about 1517. in *Germany* did the Church of God lie hid in the wilderness, some witness to the truths of God there were, but no considerable open Assemblies, that durst oppose the Popes power. The Popish *Mass-Books* were every where used, and long before the *Reformation*, the *Latine-Service* was universal; for to that height of folly was the *Holy Father* come, that he could not think it enough for the *Communion of the Church*, that they should every where pray for the same things, (which was alwaies done) and in the same words, phrases and forms (which he had brought in) unless they also did it in the same language. And this imposing of Forms, did admirably comport likewise with the ignorance and sottishness of the *Clergy* in the 6th. and 7th. age, and so downward; all the world knows, in what a pickle *Erasmus* found the world in as to *Learning*: *Reuchlin*, and he did much to amend it.

XXII. As the work of *Reformation* improved, the *Mass-books* were thrown out in *England*, nothing considerable was done until the 2. and 3. of *Edward the 6.* which was about the year 1549, and 1550. King *Edward* observing that Divine Service was, throughout his Kingdom, yet used in an unknown tongue, and that in several modes, (here was the *Com. Pr.* after the use of *Sarum*, *York*, *Bangor*, *Lincolne*, &c.) appointed the *Archbishop of Canterbury*, (*Cranmer*) and several other Bishops and Learned men, to make one convenient order, rite and fashion of *Common Prayer* for publick use. Which they did, and presented it to the King, and it was imposed by *Authority of Parliament*, in the first year of his Reign. In this first Book, were many gross remains of *Superstition*: The King therefore causeth it to be revised again, explained and made fully perfect, and this second Form was established by *Authority of Parliament*, Anno 5. and 6. Ed. 6. and annexed and joyned so explained and perfected, to that Statute, adding also a form and manner of consecrating *Archbishops*, &c.

Stat. 1. Ed. 6. 1.

Stat 5 & 6.
Ed. 6. 1. 1.

XXIII. These prudent Reformers; considering they had to do with a people newly come out of the *dreags of Popery*, did not think fit at once to do all that was to do: In the first Edition of the *Com-*

mon Prayer Book, they left (if we remember right) Prayers for the dead still to be used, gave directions for using the Cross in the administering the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. In the Second Edition, these and other things were left out; neither did they think fit at that time to make a new *Lyturgy*, (the Common people would have thought it a new Religion) they therefore translate the old *Gregorian Missal*, leaving out the Prayers for the Pope, and to Saints, and for Saints departed, and a few such things, as could not be used without palpable Idolatry, and translate the other Prayers in the *Mass-Book* out of Latine into English, and these were some of them established by that Act, 5. 6. Ed. 6. Stat. 1. The truth of this any one that can understand Latine may convince himself of, by comparing the *Mass-Book* with the *Com. Pr.* of Edw. 6. Where he will find betwixt 40. and 50. Collects translated *verbatim*; and if he compares the other parts with the *Roman Breviary*, the *Roman Ritual*, and the *Pontificale Romanum*, he will yet further see the truth of it.

5 Eliz c 28.

XXIV. Nor indeed could it be imagined, that those first Reformers should leave at that time all Ministers at liberty, or to their own conceived Prayers, when most of them were Papists in their hearts & generally so foolishly ignorant, and insufficient, that they could not have done any thing. Which very cause held in Qu. Eliz. time, (where 1 El. c. 2. the Common Prayer was with some further emendations (specified in the Statute, again imposed) In the 5th. year of her Reign, by Act of Parliament, the Common Prayer was ordered to be translated into *Welsh*, and used in *Wales*. And this is the true Story both of *Lyturgies* in the General, and the *English Lyturgy* in special.

Bish. Hall Remonstr., p. 13.

XXV. By this time the Reader, who hath not a mind to revive Pythagoras his School again, and to sacrifice his Reason to an *avus epi*, & believe every thing that is told him, before he hath tried the truth of it, may see reason to desire the present Lo. Bish. of Exeter to tell him (if he can) where those same ancient models of *Lyturgies* (not *Roman*, but *Christian*) and contrived by the holy Martyrs and Confessors of the blessed Reformation of Religion, are to be found? The Remonstrant was challenged, to make it good out of ancient Models, but thought fit to wave the business in his Reply. It hath been the old Plea, but let them prove it if they can, (saith Diocletianus.) Or if his present Lordship of Exeter doth not think fit to answer for another, yet it is reason that he should justify his

OWN

own words. He hath told us, in p. 8. of his *Considerations touching the Lyurgy*, That, "The Ancient Churches from the very first Century did use such publick wholsom Forms of sound words in their Sacramental celebrations especially, and afterwards in other holy Administrations or publick duties as made up their solemn, devout and publick Lyurgies, which Patterns, all Modern and Reformed Churches of any Renown, have followed according to the many Scriptural Examples and Expressions in set Forms of Prayer, Psalms, Confessions and Benedictions, commended to us by holy men in all ages, and by Christ himself.

XXVI. The world is grown too wary to believe any thing of this, because any one saith so; and the Doctor is too wise, to undertake to prove this: Let him prove, That *Christ prescribed the Lords Prayer for a Form, or that the Apostles ever used it so.* 2. Let him prove, that in any of the four first Centuries there was any Stated Forms of Prayer used in the Church. 3. Let him prove, that any *Modern Reformed Churches imposed any Forms of Prayer, so that those and no other might be used.* And 4, That they did this after the Pattern of the *Ancient Churches from the first Century.* All these things are to be proved; nor is it possible to prove them.

XXVII. In the 18th. p. of that Discourse, he tels us, That, "It is a Jesuitical Artifice and back-blow used by some to aver, though falsely, That the English Lyurgy was nothing else but the Romish Missal or Mass-book turned into English: 'Tis true, he saith, some things (very scriptural) devout and excellent, which the Roman Missal had taken, and retained after the ancient Form of Lyurgies of the Church, were severed and taken as Wheat from Chaffe, and Jewels from Dross, by our wise Reformers, and preserved in the English Lyurgy, conform to pious and unspotted Authority. We challenge *Dr. Gauden* and all others of his mind, to make this good if they can. It is true, there are some things in the English Lyurgy, that are not in the *Gregorian Missal*. But let any one take *Missale Romanum*, both the old one, and that established by the Council of Trent: *Breviarium Romanum*, *Rituale Romanum*, and *Pontificale Romanum*. and compare them all with the printed Com. Prayer-book of 5 & 6 E. 6. and then judge whether he can find a 6th. part of the latter, which is in none of the former. If he finds that there is very little added, let him then learn how to truit men talking after such a magisterial rate, and annexing no proofs of their words.

*Dr. Gauden
Consider. p. 19.*

XXVIII. If

XXVIII. If the Reader finds it true, that (whatsoever Dr. Gauden saith) there is in our *English Lyturgy*, as it is commonly exposed to sale, very little but what is to be found in the *Mass-book* in Latine, let him then go to the Bishop of *Exeter*, and desire him (for his credit sake) to shew him those *ancient Forms* of *Lyturgy* used in the Church, out of which these *Forms* of Prayer were transcribed and taken, which must be immediately after the first *Century*; or tell him, what that same *pious* and *unspotted authority* is, If he tels him, it is *Pope Gregories*, (which he must if he speaks truth) let him tell him, that he hath heard, that he was a vile wretch, accused for a *Murderer*, the *Father* of most of the *superstitious usages* now in the Church of *Rome*, one who understood not the *Greek Tongue*, (as himself confesseth) a man of no admirable Judgment (witness his pretended Commentaries upon *Job*, which might have as well been upon the *Revelation*) a man very far from being either *pious* or *unspotted*, or fit for his *Seat*, one that defended *Purgatory*, that fawned upon *Phocas* the *Murderer* in short, one of no deserved Name or Authority in the Church of God.

XXIX. By this Discourse it appears, that there was no *Lyturgy* directing *Forms* of Prayers for the Church, till *Pope Gregories* time Anno 600. nor any imposed till the time of *Charles* the Great, Anno 800. when all manner of *superstitious usages* were brought into the Church; nor was it then imposed without a *Persecution* attending it. And this, Reader, is the *pious* and *unspotted Authority*; the Bishop tels thee of. From hence thou wilt also conclude, the antiquity of the *English Lyturgy*, the reason of its first being imposed, and no further reformed, either by *K. Edw.* or by *Qu. Elizabeth*. In *King James* his time, it received some additions, what Reformation we cannot tell.

XXX. By all this Discourse, it appeareth that there is no divine Prescript, no *Apostolical Tradition*, no *Universal Tradition*, no Example of the *Purer Primitive Churches*, for more than 400. year, 700 years after Christ, which can be pleaded for imposed *Forms* of Prayer, by any that make any conscience of their words, nor will undertake to prove what they say.

CHAP. IV.

An Enquiry into the state of those Churches which first commended or imposed Lyturgies, at the time when they first made such Impositions.

I. **T**Hough it may seem absurd to enquire, whether the *gray hairs* of *Lyturgies* be found in the way of *Righteousness*? when we have evinced, that they have no such pretended *Antiquity* and *Age* to glory in, and that the Assertors of such *Antiquity* for them, do but *impose* upon the world; yet considering what we remember we have learned out of *Aristotle*, That there is a youthfulness in respect of *Age*, or in respect of *Manners* and *Conditions*. It may be worthy of a further enquiry, Whether yet there may not be such a *necessity* of them, or such a *comeliness*, *beauty* and *gravity* in them, as may not only justify *Magistrates* in the imposing of them, but oblige every soul that hath ought to do with reason, to fall in with the use of them, yea passionately to desire them (even as *Rachel* did children) which we shall the better determine, by reviewing the first occasions of *Lyturgies*, and the complexion of the Church in those ages, when they were first made, or most used.

II. I think we may say of *Lyturgies*, as *Christ* said of the *Bill of Divorce*, which *Moses* allowed; *Moses* verily for the hardness of your hearts, gave you a *Bill of divorce*, but from the beginning it was not so. He that had a residue of *Spirit* (as the Prophet saith) made one for one. The Church played *Moses* his part in the business of *Forms of Prayer*. *Christ* who had a residue of *Spirit*, the *Spirit* given him without measure, imposed no *Forms of Prayer* upon his *Ministers*, or Church. The *Apostles*, who had the first and most plentiful pourings out of the *Spirit of Grace*, imposed no such things. *Christ* indeed gave a more general direction to his People in *Prayer*, to ask things according to the *Will of God*, and in his *Name*; and more particular directions in that excellent *Form*, called the *Lords Prayer*; but that (as *Durantis* idly saith) either *Christ*, or his *Apostles* used the *Lords Prayer* (ordinarily) as a *Form of words* in *Prayer*, or that the *Apostles* used a *Form of words* to express their Faith,

Faith, or imposed the Creed (commonly called, but hardly to be proved) theirs (which the same Author asserteth) must certainly be proved out of some such *Canonical Writings*, as the Epistles of Christ to *Abagarus*, or to *Paul* and *Peter*, for there is no authentick Record of any such things; but in process of time indeed the Church began to do some such things.

Rev 3. 17.

III. The highest mention we can find, is, that thin *Synod* of the Church of *Laodicea*, made up of 32 *Bishops*; and this (whatever Bishop *Hall* saith according to *Longus*) cannot be proved (as we said before) to have been before the year 364. (as to which time *Balsamon* and *Caranza* agree it) but truly it had been no great wonder if this Church which many years before was grown neither hot nor cold, but in such a temper, that God was ready to *spue it out of his mouth* (for which we have an authentick record in the *Revelation*) should long before this time have made such a *Salve* and prudent Provision for the Laziness of her Ministers: He that shall read the *Canons* of that *Synod*, against the Ministers hanting *Taverns*, and using *Inchantments*; as also the other *Canons* about *exorcising*, and the several *Officers* and *Offices* of the Church, will see reason enough to conclude, the woful corruption of the Church in those parts, if not to suspect, that it was of a far lower date than is pretended.

IV. The *Synod* of 40 *Bishops* at *Carthage*, (which was the 3d. *Synod* of *Carthage*) only enjoyned Ministers to communicate to their more able brethren, *their Prayers composed for their publick Congregations*; this was in the year 397. Yet that the face of the Church at this time, had many spots, and much impurity cleaving to it, may appear by this *Synod*, by their 6th. *Can.* against giving the *Lords Supper* to, or *Baptizing such as were dead*: by their many *Canons*, 17, 25, 27. against *Clergymen* hanting *Taverns*, and keeping scandalous company with women, their 30. *Can.* against *joyial Meetings in Churches*. their 36 *Can.* about the *Chrisma* or the anointing Oyl, which no *Presbyters* must make. And that this *Synod* consisted not of the most infallibly wise Fathers, appears, by their Learned 29 *Canon*; where they take pains to decree that every Minister should give the *Sacrament of the Altar* (so it seems they had learned to call the *Lords Supper*) *fasting*. Yet this *Synod* in the *business of Prayer*, did not think fit to restrain every Minister, only having so loose and insufficient a *Clergy*, they order the weaker sort, having composed Prayers, to confer their Notes (before they used them)

them) *cum fratribus instructionibus*, with their more able Brethren.

V. After this, the Council of *Mela*, Anno 416. grew more bold; and ordain (as to their Province, for what authority had they further?) that the Ministers should use no Prayers, but such as that Synod had approved. They might justly expect, that the Churches under their inspection would hardly swallow this new Pill, if it were not lapped up in some good Reason, and therefore they give their reason for it, lest something should be vented against the true Doctrine of Faith, either by some Ministers negligence or ignorance. The cause of that Synods Meeting, was the censuring of *Pelagius*, that great enemy of Grace.

The Errors which *Pelagius* had broached, were these;

1. That Adam should have died though he had never sinned.
2. That Infants were born without Original sin.
3. That there is no need of the assisting Grace of God (sin being once pardoned.)
4. That all the need we have of Grace is, to illuminate us in the knowledge of Gods Commandments.
5. That the Grace of God only helpeth us to do his will more easily and freely.

6. That the words of St. John, If we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, were only figuratively true, not literally.

7. That the Saints praying, Forgive us our Trespases, was appointed them on the behalf of others, not themselves.

Or, 8. If for themselves, only as an expression of their humility: not concluding them to have any sins to be forgiven.

Against these Errours that Reverend Synod made their 8 first Canons. *Pelagius* having used diverse Arts (the story is too long to insert) to secure his Doctrine from a publick Censure, had far diffused the poyson of this Doctrine. This Reverend Synod observing his Errors to be in such things as are the daily matter of Ministers Confessions and Supplications, thought fit for the prevention of the diffusing this *Venom* by Ministers in their publick prayers, as also that the Church might have due confessions made, as well of Original sin as Actual, and due Petitions put up for pardoning and assisting Grace, &c. And considering that the Church was so debauched now in her Clergy, that some through ignorance could not do it, some through Laziness would neglect a due care in doing that to which they were able. Others possibly (though that be

conceded) through a perverse and corrupted Judgment, would not do it, appointed Forms of Prayer to be used, and restrain the liberty of Praying to the Ministers within that Province, obliging them to use the Forms approved by the Synod.

VI. The reason for which (as *Durantius* tells us) *Theodosius* much about this time, or a little before, set *St. Hierom* to compose a *Calendar*, indeed rather than a *Liturgy* (for *Durantius* saith, he did no more than order the *Scriptures* to be read, though *Pamellius* hath transmitted to us an *Antiphonary* and *Sacramental Liturgy*, as well as a *Lectionary* of his composing) was in regard of *Heresies* risen up in the Church. So that hitherto, we have had no other account given us of the composing Forms for publick worship, than 1. The Ignorance of the Ministry which they were forced to employ. Or 2. Their Laziness and Negligence. Or 3. Their, or the Peoples falling into Errors.

VII. But after that the *Universal Bishop* got up into the Saddle, it was reasonable that he should have a power of *Universal command*, and to shew his authority, he must impose a compleat *Liturgy* (as to all parts) and enjoin *universal conformity*, which yet he could never obtain, till he got a great Interest in the *Civil Magistrate*; who had a civil power over what was then almost the *universal Church*. Nor must this serve the turn, for this *Universal Bishop* must have all Churches, not only speak the same words and phrases, but in the same *Language* too; hence he brings in *Latine Service*. All which also admirably comported with the *sottish ignorance* and *debauchery* of the *Clergy*, in the 6th. & 7th. *Century*, and so downward, till the times of *Reuchlin* and *Erasmus*, when Reformation began to dawn, and the light began to spring out of darkness. Whether these ends were good and lawful, and the imposing of Forms of publick divine Worship were applied as just means in order to them, viz. either to cure the *ignorance* or *negligence* of the *Clergy*, or to bring the Church to an *unity* in *Doctrine*, *Worship* or *Affection*, shall be examined: For if either the *end* or *means* be proved unlawful and against the Will of God, they talk vainly for the continuance of them, that urge no more than *Humane Prudence*, *Worldly Wisdom*, being no other than perfect Folly, because *Enmity to God*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Universal Conformity of Devotion, as to words and Syllables, no good End. Imposing Forms of Prayer no reasonable, just or sufficient Means to prevent Heresies, or to cure the Laziness or Insufficiency of the Church, proved by Reason and by Experience.

I. **I**T cannot but be confessed, that it is a *noble end* for any Church to aim at, to take care, that the people may have the truths of God asserted to them, and not through the *ignorance or laziness, or perverseness* of its Ministers, be served with an Husk in stead of bread, or a Scorpion in stead of a Fish. This end is approveable both from the *Word of God*, and the *Light* of all Christian Reason. But that there should be an *Oneness* in the devotion of people, as to Letters and Syllables, and Phrases, and Forms of Sentences, is an end so little, and low and insignificant in it self, that we cannot expect it should be justified from Scripture, which indeed saith not a word to that purpose.

II. And although the prevention of *Errors & Heresies*, & the poisoning of people with them, as also the prevention of the mischief arising to the Church from *ignorant and lazy, or erroneous Preachers or Ministers*, be (as I said before) a *noble end*, and well worthy of the Churches care, yet before we can allow the same honour to the imposing of *Lyturgies* and stinted *Forms of Prayer*, as means in order to those ends, we must both enquire, whether they be *lawful means*; and also, 2. Whether they be such as *Reason* will evince, or *experience* hath proved effectual to the obtaining those ends, and that 3. *Without bringing upon the Church a mischief every way as great*, as what they are pretended to deliver us from.

III. That when Christ himself appointed *no stated Forms of public Devotion* for his Church, to the use of which, and no other they should be tied; nor his Apostles, though guided by an infallible Spirit; nor the *Purer Church* for some hundred years after, it should remain yet lawful for the Church, not content to repress and prevent Errors and Heresies, by such waies and means as the

Apostles used, but by this new device, to endeavour it, may be justly a question to all sober Christians.

IV. Especially considering, that as a *liberty in coming to the Throne of Grace*, and asking there whatsoever we will (provided it be consonant to the *Will of God*, and begged in the *Name of Christ*) is one of the great priviledges purchased by Christ for his Church; so the Spirit of *Grace and Supplication* is eminently and frequently promised for their assistance, and that not only to teach them *how to pray*, but *what to pray for*, Rom. 8.26. Nor is this promised only to the *Prelates* in a Church, but to every individual Christian; and the *gift of Prayer*, whence flows mens abilities to express themselves by words and phrases, is one of the most excellent gifts which we are bound to covet, and to improve. All which being considered, it is far from being clear, that the restraining of Christians, especially of Ministers in the exercise of the noble gift of Prayer in the publick *Assemblies* of the Church, is a lawful means in order to any end, it looking like that *quenching of the Spirit*, which is forbidden to all men by the Apostle, 1 *Thes.* 5.19. and choaking the *coveting of the best gifts*, which is commanded all Christians, 1 *Cor.* 14.1. For to what purpose should those Talents be desired, which man hath authority to command to be laid up in a *Napkin*? Nay which had far better be laid up in a *Napkin*, than used, if the Doctrine of some be true, concerning the *transcendent excellency of Forms of Prayer*, above what are conceived by Ministers, according to the gift of God bestowed upon them.

V. Besides, it may be worthy of enquiry, whether it be possible, or at least ordinary with men to read any *Prayer*, with that fixed and constant *intention of mind* and *fergency of spirit* (the two necessary requisites of Prayer) as they may speak unto God from the dictate of their own hearts, while their souls are more abstracted from created Objects, than they can possibly be, while it is a great piece of their work to look upon their Books, to see what to say next: For what some pretend, that the diversion is greater in *conceived Prayer*, by the employment of the mind in prompting the tongue what it should say next; besides that this is a spiritual employment of the mind within it self, neither doth it require any such study, where the heart is right with God, and so conscious as it should be of its own sins and wants, and so acquainted with the Word and Promises of God, as every reasonable Minister ought to be.

VI. Nor

VI. Nor is it out of the way to consider whether this method of *Book-praying*, will not expose the *Ministers of the Gospel*, to a perfect contempt amongst the people, who will certainly conclude their *Parson* not able to do what every ordinary Christian doth. Of which contempt we have had a plentiful experience, nor do we believe that any thing hath so contributed to our breed of *Lay-preachers* as our *Stinted forms of prayer*; Whilst the people have apprehended their gifts better than their Ministers, an easy temptation hath served them to usurp their Office. Nor will any Minister longer keep his authority amongst a knowing people, then by his performances of his Office, they shall be convinced he is higher in gifts than themselves; For rational people will not sacrifice a blind faith to the *Bish. of Exeter* magnifying the forms of prayer in the *Common-prayer-book* beyond all measure, but will be enquiring, wherein their excellency lies. Are they more perfect Summaries of things to be confessed, or to be petitioned for? Is their phrase more scriptural? &c. or if they do see an excellency in them, it will be hard to informe them, that the *gift of reading* is more admirable in their Minister at Church, then in their servant at home.

VII. Now if the *Universal imposing* of any forms upon the aforementioned considerations, appear unlawfull of it self, or in regard of some necessary or certain consequent; there needs no more be said to prove that men should have made use of some other means in order to those good ends of preventing errors, and the mischiefs arising, or possible to arise from a *negligent and ignorant Ministry*, to the *Church of Christ*.

VIII. But suppose the use of this means *lawful*, yet if *Reason* might then dictate unto them that applied this means, *That it was never like to effect its end*; and *Experience* hath since taught posteritie that upon the experience of 80. years, it hath proved ineffectual, certainly the very light of Nature should have taught the first imposers, to have used some other means, and will yet direct us (who have the advantage of experience) in this, to excel our Fore-fathers.

IX. It may put the rational world into a fit of astonishment to consider that so many *Bishops* should think that the imposing of formes of prayer, would ever contribute any thing to cure the *ignorance or negligence* of the *Clergy*, when in very deed, it was the right way to feed both, and to continue these scabs upon the *Church* for

for ever. For a man to be able to compose a prayer fit for a congregation, requires no lesse then a very competent skill in the *whole body of Divinity*, and a very large *knowledge of the Scriptures* which would have engaged ministers to study the *Scriptures* and to stir up their gifts. But when they had once thus provided for them, there needed no more skil for a Parson, then every ordinary person had, *viz.* an ability to read the written prayers. It is true, they had yet some work to do in *preaching*, but this was soon taken off their shoulders, by adding still formes of prayer, the reading of which should require such a length of time, that no roome was left for Sermons, or if there were, *Homilies* came quickly after which would serve the turn: So that these imposed *Liturgies*, in stead of serving their end, in curing the *ignorance* or *negligence* of Ministers, did most wretchedly serve to fill the Church, with *ignorant and lazy persons* yea and debauchd too, for now the Ministers work was ready, and he might stay at the Ale-house till Saturday and yet be as fit for his work, or at least do as much the next day, as was required of him, which was not only miserably exemplified in the *Papish Church* (til *Erasmus* his time and the beginnings of reformation, when they began by the Protestants opposition to be quickened to a little better attendance to their work) but is at this day sufficiently evident as to the generality of their *Priests*, to say nothing of the liberal experience of it, which our own Nation hath afforded.

X Nor certainly could just reason dictate it a proper or adequate means to prevent, or restrain Errors and Heresies: for how should this ever do it? shall preaching by a *form imposed* be superadded to praying? or shall there be *forms of prayer* imposed for the Pulpit as well as the Desk? These certainly had been too grosse impositions. If not; had not the Ministers as much liberty to vent their Errors in their Pulpit-prayers, as they would have had in the Desk? or in their Sermons as in their prayers? But then people would have apprehended, they say, that they vented their own conceits, not the doctrine of the Church? And would they not far better have apprehended this, if the Minister had only been enjoyned to read a perfect *Systeme of the doctrine of Faith* summarily darwn up. (Such was the wisdom of the Council of Nice in the case, though indeed that *Creed* be far from a *perfect Systeme*) This no sober Minister would have scrupled. Besides *Heresies* are commonly the issue of *Schimes*, and experience hath told the world

34
world that nothing ever so contributed to the breeding of *Schismes* in the Church, as *imposed formes of prayer* have done: So contrary yath it appeared to the *Sensus communis* of Christians in all times, *that the Ministers of the Gospel should be restrained in the gift of prayer*, I say in all times since the *Reformation of the Church*, nor would the *Popish Church* have ever been able to have imposed theirs so long upon the people, if besides that *Fire and Sword* which alwaies attends his *Holinesse*, his commands in case of disobedience; they had not wisely kept the people from the sight of the Scriptures, or from the hearing of any Sermons (almost:) For nothing but the peoples ignorance, could have secured this *devotion* so long. And no sooner came the light of knowledge amongst the people, but many of them either saw, or thought they saw, that this kind of *Praying* was not all that God required of his Ministers. And in those Churches where were *forms of prayer* (though translated into an intelligible tongue) there were continual *Factions* and *Separations* from that which they called the Church, and more in *England* then else-where, because no reformed Church had such a *Liturgie*, nor so imposed.

XI But suppose the imposing formes of prayer lawfull, and that it had effected its end, done something to prevent *Errors & Heresies*, and some *mischiefs* which from the *Ignorance* and *Negligence* of Ministers might have come upon the Church. If yet the *mischiefe* coming by the *means*, used hath been, or is like to be as great, as that which they are designed to prevent, (or though not so great) if there be other *more proper and regular means* (not subject to the same ill consequences) and more certain to obtain the end which may be used, certainly all prudent men, will conclude that, these old ineffectual mischeious means, should be no longer used, but those far better applied.

XII The mischiefs which the *imposing formes of prayer* have brought upon the Church, have been, 1. The *nursing* up of a notoriously *ignorant* and *lazy Clergy*, not giving themselves to *meditation* and *Prayer* (two of those things which *Luther* thought necessary to make a *Divine*) 2. *Separation from Church Assemblies*. 3. Dreadful *Persecutions* upon *Godly Ministers and people*, who could not judg their *conformity* lawfull. The Admirers of these formes persuading Princes to establish them by their civill authority, and then suggesting to them, that the Ministers and peoples not complying with them was out of a principle of disloyalty to their
Princes,

Princes, and disaffection to their authority, and bringing *non-conformists* under the crime of *Læſe Magiſtratiſ*, evils certainly not much leſſe, then what *Impoſed forms* were pretended to prevent.

XIII. Yet were the continued uſe of theſe means in order to ſuch ends more tolerable, if there were no other to be found moſt certainly juſtifiable, far more regular, and more effectual, as to the end. Would the *Prelates of the Church* prevent the riſe and growth of errors & hereties by the Miniſters *negligence, ignorance, or perverted Judgement*? Let them, & Take care, that none be admitted into the *Minifterial Office* or truſted with the charge of Souls, but ſuch as ſhal be thoroughly examin'd, as to their knowledge in the body of *Divinity*, & of whoſe gift in prayer, they ſhal have taken an *Experiment*, and who ſhal not firſt by ſome open Act declare his *Aſſent* to the *doctrine of Faith*. May they notwithstanding this be lazy? or afterwards perverted in judgement? To what purpoſe ſerve *Synods, Presbyteries, &c.* But to take a conſtant account of the Miniſters of ſeveral Pariſhes? how they uſe their gifts? diſcharge their Office? to admoniſh, the irregular, ſuſpend, deprive them, &c. Certainly as this means is more proper and more regular, more rational for the obtaining the aforeſaid ends, ſo the uſe of it would be far more effectual, and all good people would be ſatiſfied, and rejoyce in it.

XIV. From this diſcourſe it appears, that the pretended *neceſſity* of a *Liturgy* or *impoſed forms* of prayer in any Church, is no other then ſuch as the author of *Diſcoliminius* told us merrily, *Von Doſme* conceived there was, when the fire burnt his Shins, that the *Chimny ſhould be pulled down and ſet farther off*, when it had been more eaſy, and every whit as effectual for him to have removed his Shins from the fire; yea ſuch as (the ſame author tels us) was the *neceſſity* which *Simon* the French Monk ſaw, that the poor people of a *Province of France* were under (wanting cloathes) to *flea themſelves and ſend their Skins to be tanned*, that they might have cloathes for their backs, when as they eaſily ſaw, the remedy would be as bad as the diſeaſe. In very deed there can be no preſence of the neceſſitie of *impoſed forms* of prayer, for the obtaining any of the Ends aforeſaid, of which aſſertion we have a demonſtration both in the Church of *Scotland*, and other reformed Churches, where there is no ſuch *impoſed Liturgies*, though poſſibly

sibly most of them have *Lyturgies* composed, to be used at liberty.

XV. Nor would any sober persons oppose the *composing* of a *Lyturgy*, for publick Assemblies, which might by way of *punishment* be enjoined to those to use, whom the Governours of the Church should suspect perverted by Error, or discern *lazy* and *negligent*, as to the *stirring up* of the Gift of God bestowed upon them. But that such Forms should be *imposed upon all*, cannot certainly be either *lawfully* or *prudently* advised or wished, lest Gods Gifts given to his Ministers, should be *smothered*, their desires to improve them, (according to Gods Command) *quenched*, good people *scandalized*, and the most *ignorant, negligent*, and worst of men encouraged in the highest Services of God. In fine, lest the hearts of any Subjects by such unwelcome Impositions, should be *alienated from their Magistrates*, who (except in the matters of their God) desire no other Priviledges or Liberties from them, as the reward of their daily Prayers and Allegiance, than their own goodnes shall prompt them to give them.

CHAP. VI.

A particular Examination of the five late Arguments used by the Bishop of Exeter, to evince the Necessity or high Expedience of a Lyturgy.

I. **W**E have hitherto considered whatsoever Antiquity could pretend for the usefulness of imposed Forms of Prayer in the Church, and weighed them in the Ballance of Reason; but the Reverend Bishop of Exeter improves the notion of their usefulness higher, telling us, *they have very many great, and good influences, upon true Religion and upon every Church*; which he endeavoureth to make good in five Instances, which we shall crave leave modestly to examine.

II. First, He saith, *It conduceth much to the more solemn, complete, and august and reverent worship of the Divine Majesty, in Christian Congregations, where otherwise the most Sacred and venerable mysteries must be exposed to that rudeness and unpreparedness, that barrenness*

ness and superficialness, that defect and deformity, both in matter, manner, judgment and expression, to which every private Minister is daily subject, as late experience hath taught us. It will be very hard to find any thing in this more then words.

1. It will be granted, that the publick Service of God ought to be performed *solemnly, reverently and compleatly*; for that same august serving of God, we do not well understand the Doctors meaning; if he means *outward Pomp and Splendor*, in the habits of those that serve at the Altar, or lofty high flown phrases, swelling words of vanity, we never read that God either required it, or delighted in it, nor can we from any reason conclude the necessity of it or usefulness of it, as being contrary to all the Copies of Prayers and Sermons set us by Christ or his Apostles, and no way fited to the *simplicity and plainness* of the Gospel-Devotion: God is unquestionably then served most *reverently and solemnly*, when the worshippers of him approach him with most fear, and worship him with most affection and *servency of spirit*, wrestling with God, (as Jacob did) which the Prophet interprets by *weeping and making Supplications*.

2. It is true, that Minister sins, who (through *ignorance or negligence*) expresseth any want of *Reverence of God* in his heart, by *impertinent and rude expressions*, (not fitting to be used in civil converse with men) or which may make the Service of God contemptible to others.

3. But that every minister must needs be thus guilty, (with the Doctors leave) *experience* hath not taught us, and is very uncharitably and falsely asserted. We have not (blessed be God) such a pitiful Church, that there are no Ministers in it, but are liable to the charge of serving God in Prayer with *rudeness, unpreparedness, barrenness, superficiality, defect, deformity*, and that both in *matter, manner, judgment and expression*. No Jesuit ever had the confidence so to asperse the Ministry of England, nor could speak more sordidly to their dishonour. Possibly there may be some, (and there have been far more than now are) who may be too liable to this charge. But where's the fault? Is it not in those to whom the trust is committed of taking a due cognizance of such as offer themselves to be *ordained*, or admitted to the cure of souls? Should not they take care to admit none, but such as are both able to preach and to pray? Do they not discharge their work conscientiously, while they admit such as are not able to pray, without
such

such rudeness as is here complained of? or make no more conscience of it, than to do it *unpreparedly, superficially*, with so much barrenness, defect and deformity? such as neither have judgment to compose a Prayer, as to matter, nor *elocution* to pray, as to manner, so, but that people shall have just cause to *nauseate* the Worship of God.

4. If the Doctor means (by his phrase of *every Minister being subject, &c.*) only that 'tis possible that the best Ministers may be negligent, &c. as to run upon this Rock, that is as true concerning *reading Prayers*: none will deny, but he that can read very well, may read false, and if he keeps not his mind intent, no doubt but he will perform the Service, as *rudely* and *superficially* by reading, as by speaking; Instances might be given of this, and shall if need be: And certainly the conceiving of a Prayer will command more attention of mind, than reading can. All therefore said under this Head, is meer air.

III. But Secondly, He tells us, *That a Lyurgy is a most excellent means to preserve the truth of Christian and Reformed Doctrine, by the consonancy of publick Devotions, into which otherwise corrupt minds are apt to infuse the sour Leaven of their own corrupt Opinions.* Fine words again! But what reason? we have before shewed it to be,

1. *Questionable, whether a Lawful means or no.*
2. *If lawful, by no means effectual, except it reach to all Praying and Preaching too.*
3. *Not the only means, a good Summary of Christian Faith is far more proper and rational.*
4. *A means bringing a mischief as bad as what it pretends to cure, yea far worse, fit for nothing but to breed rents and separations, the mothers of all Heresies.*
5. *An Apochryphal means by which men make themselves wiser than Christ and his Apostles, or the Purer Church. We shall only propound this Question upon this suggestion: If this be true, how comes it to pass, that all the Arminians and Popishly affected Clergy-men of England are such Zealots for a lyurgy? The thing is demonstrably true, that it is so; let the Doctor answer this Question by his next.*

IV. But Thirdly, A Lyurgy (he saith) *is necessary for the holy Harmony and sweet communion of all Christians, as well in National, as Parochial Churches, whilst thereby they are all kept in one mind and*

Spirit, praying the same things, and chearfully saying Amen to the same Praises and Petitions. Here is the old Fallacy still of *Verba elegantia, pro sensu simplici*, That all Christians have the same common wants, and ought to pray for the same things in the main, is to be granted, though as particular persons, so particular Churches may have renewing wants, not common to all (for which a *Liturgy* will not serve the turn) But is there any so simple, as not to understand, that the same things may be prayed for in different words and phrases? The Doctor here mistook his Mark, he should have proved, that it is the Will of God that Christians should maintain their Communion in the use of the same phrases, letters and syllables.. And when he had done that, a Popish Priest should have improved his Notion, and concluded that because the one body of Christ should have but one tongue, and since the confusion at Babel, men in several nations have spoke several languages; therefore to the perfection of the Communion of the Church, there is not only a Liturgy necessary, but a Liturgy every where in Latine, that being a Language most universally known. The Churches external Communion lyes in their keeping the same Sabbath, performing the same Acts of worship (of which prayer is one) confession of Original and Actual sins, praying for the same mercies generally, &c. not in their saying all the same words sure.

He tells us (fourthly) That a Liturgical form is not onely of great benefit, and comfort to the more knowing, judicious, and well-bred sort of Christians, but highly to their security, and to the holy and humble composure of their spirit in the worship of God, who otherwise are prone not onely amidst the publique devotions curiously to censure, but scoffingly to despise, (By the way this is no Demonstration, neither of their Christianity, nor of their good breeding) yea many times to laugh at, and at best to pity, or deplore, the evident defects and incongruities which appear in many Ministers odd expressions, and incongruous wayes of officiating, &c.

To reduce these many words to a short sum of reason, the usefulness of imposed Liturgies is here pleaded. 1. For the benefit of the most knowing, judicious, and well-bred sort of Christians. 2. To avoid the censures, scoffs, and jeers of others. The Dr. hath not yet told us what benefit accrues to the former from a Liturgy, nor yet what solid grounds of comfort for them to feed upon, the want of which it may be is the reason, that if others guess rightly, that take all the professors of Religion that can but give any understanding

standing account of the Systeme of Divinity, and live in any sobriety of life and conversation, and number them (taking their judgment as you go along) and it will be found, that ten for one are against any imposed Forms: On the other side, it is certain, that some others make it all their Religion: So it was of old. That Holy and Learned *Oeculampadius* living in a Noble mans house, who yet was a Protestant, and would seem a forward man in the Reformation, complains of the slender regard the greatest part of the Family gave to him, and to his Ministry, in a Letter to his Friend in these words, "Such a man (saith he) sent for me, that I might publickly in the Church instruct his Family in the Christian Religion, or rather feed them with the words of Christ, who were initiated already. I counted it my chief duty to make the Evangelical Law known familiar at hand to them, that so afterwards they might of themselves proceed in the true and sincere study of Christianity, Peace, Meekness, Modesty, Charity, Piety, Faith and Confidence in God. All the time of *Lent* that I was there, nothing hindred, but that I might every day read a piece of the Gospel to them, and expound it, and exhort them out of it to the study of Godliness: But after *Easter*, it was less convenient; for the Family was not at leisure to spend much time at Church, their business did so call upon them; and there are some that are sick of the Church, if they tarry there never so little while. *plerisq; ut ferme ubiq; mos est, &c.* Most people, as the manner is, *amant quotidie audire, imo videre Sacrum*; love to hear, yea to see service every day, yea to hear those things mumbled over, that they understand not, to see the Ceremonies, to be present at the Blessing, to commend themselves perfunctorily unto God, and so think they have been religious enough of all conscience in that day wherein they have done this, *quod sane exigui fructus est, & credo plerisq; interim conducibilis esset arare & texere*; which truly (saith he) is little worth, and I am persuaded it were better for many to have been plowing or weaving, or Riving of Logs, or doing any other work. And (if they may be believed, nor is it incredible) find more comfort in the *Liturgie* than in all the Promises of the Gospel, the reason is, *Missæ non mordet*. For the *Scoffes* and *Fears* of such as are possessed with a Spirit of Prophanesse, 'tis hard to avoid them. Nor are we further concerned, than not to give just cause to them to prophane the Worship of God; which may be done without a *Liturgie*, if the

L. 1. *Epist. Oeculamp. & Zuinglii* These words may be a Glass for these times.

the Governors of the Church take due care, that none but persons fit in respect both of Parts and Piety be admitted to, or continued in the exercise of the Office of the Ministry.

V. But it seems this Master of our *Lyturgical Feast* hath kept his *best wine till the last*, for he tels us, that a *Lyturgy* is necessary, or conduceth at least mightily——*above all——to the edification and salvation, as well as the unanimity and peace of the meanest sort of People.* *Salvation and Edification* in order to it, are great things, so also are *unanimity and peace*, and doubtless by all just and lawful means to be endeavoured: But how shall a *Lyturgy* conduce to these? Certainly the Captain of our *Salvation* hath directed the best and most proper means for the *Salvation and Edification* of souls, and we need not devise other than what he hath appointed; yet did he never institute a *Lyturgy*, nor the Apostles after him. He tels us, That a daily variety of *Expressions in Prayer or Sacraments*, is much at one (to the Vulgar) with *Latine Service*, little understood, and less remembered by them; they are still out, and to seek, when a new Minister officiates, yea and when the same, if he affects variety of words, where the duty is the same. For the peoples remembering, it were worth the while to examine the Vulgar people, where a *Lyturgy* is constantly used, how much they remember of it? If the Doctor would do this, he might possibly be convinced, that a *Lyturgy* is not such an effectual means to imprint *Divinity notions* in peoples memories. As to the peoples understanding, the reading of the *Lyturgy* signifies as little; if the furious Zealots for *Lyturgies* amongst the Vulgar, were examined of their sense of the several phrases, they would make a wild Interpretation. It is not the using of a *Lyturgy*, will bring people to such an understanding the *Body of Divinity* as is necessary to him that would understand a good Prayer (whether it be a stinted Form, or no) but their understanding of a good Catechisme to be wrought in them by a frequent exercise of *Catechizing*; and when they once understand the Principles of Religion, they will easily understand a Prayer, (though they do not alwaies hear the same words) where the Minister doth not affect a vanity and singularity of phrase; which if he doth, the Governors of the Church ought to restrain him, by admonition and other Censures. This is the way to make people understand Prayers, (whether the Phrase be the same, or diverse) provided it be not phantastick and vain. By this it appears, that the Bishop hath said nothing to convince the world of any necessity of

Tag. 11.

of imposed Forms, nor yet of any expediency in them. We have before offered enough against them, so that thus much may suffice to have spoken of *Imposed Forms* in the general.

CHAP. VII.

Supposing Forms of Prayer Lawful, yet every Form is not. What necessary, or reasonable to be found in publick Forms. Doctor Gaudens unhandsom and false Representations of Ministers refusing to use the Common Prayer.

I. FROM our former Discourse, every intelligent Reader will easily conclude, that we have neither asserted it unlawful to compose a *Form of Prayer*, nor yet to use it, either in private or publick, no nor yet to impose it upon some: All that we have questioned, is the lawfulness of imposing *Forms of Prayer* upon all *Ministers*; as well those whose gifts are eminently known, and their diligence and conscience in that duty sufficiently experimented, as those who either through *Ignorance* or *Laziness* are not fit to be trusted, without such a guide in the publick service of God. Nor do we think it impossible that a Minister of eminent gifts, through some bodily, or spiritual distemper, may possibly be so out of course, that he may lawfully enough help himself with a Form: but because a *Staffe* may be useful for an *old withered body*, and for a vegete and lively body, that hath accidentally got some *Vertigo* in his head, or wound in his foot, it will not therefore follow, that it is reasonable, that it be enacted, that none should walk without it.

II. But certainly in reason, those Forms which should be either publicly or privately used, should be such rare Patterns of Prayer, as might justly commend themselves to all ears, as containing full confessions of sin Original and Actual, full Petitions for spiritual and temporal Mercies, for our selves and others, as also proportionable Thanksgivings, and all these expressed in Scripture phrases, so ordered and couched, that the hearers may be convinced, that there is nothing contrary to the Will of God in them, nor any momentous thing, by Gods Will allowed us to ask, which is omitted. It

is:

is also reasonable, that such Forms should be so worded, so every way circumstantiated, that no sober ear could be offended at them, all conscientious Christians might say *Amen* to them, and if any should be needful to plead their cause, he might have more to say, than that jejune commendation, *Nothing can be said against them but may be answered, nor found in them but what is capable of a very good sense.* These are lamentable commendations for *Forms of Prayer* to be imposed upon a Church, full of holy, learned and godly Ministers and People, who cannot be cheated into a blind Belief, That *they are the best*, because such a man said so. And no private Minister must presume to rate his private abilities above the Shekel of the Sanctuary: From whence will easily be concluded, that supposing it lawful to use *Forms of Prayer* in publick, yet it will not follow, that it is lawful to use every Form that shall or may be tendered to us, but such only as for matter, manner and circumstances, shall appear to us agreeable to the Word of God.

III. We say, 1. It must appear to us that the matter of those Prayers be such as Gods Word allows us to ask of him; otherwise we ask not according to his Will. 2. That the mode and manner of Praying prescribed, be such as Gods Word alloweth, either by express Letter of Scripture, or just consequent. 3. That no appendant circumstance make the use of them unlawful, which as to the matter and manner are lawful enough. For none is so ignorant, as not to know that in matters of practise a thing may *ex accidenti* be unlawful, which is not so *per se*, or of it self.

IV. This now bringeth us from our general Discourse concerning the lawfulness or expedience of any Forms, to a more particular consideration of the particular Forms of Prayer in the *English Lyrurgy*, according to the Copies now printed and sold: (For what those were that were established by Acts of Parliament) we cannot tell, and therefore must restrain our Discourse to that *English Lyrurgy* only, which is ordinarily to be had in Stationers shops, and at adventures from thence transmitted to many Churches.

V. And we cannot but take our selves concerned a little to speak in this case, when the Bishop of Exeter thinks fit to brand all those Ministers that are willing to accept his *Majesties* most Gracious Indulgence, and to forbear the use of the Common Prayer; as also all those sober persons, that are not so fond as his Lordship of it, with *restiveness, inexcusable moroseness, an antilyturgical humor, peevishness, ingratitude, schismatical petulancy, pride*, such as only fancy

fancy they could mend some words & phrases in it, or put some *Allegories* to it, such as *sacrifice their judgments to their Credits*, yea, and (he had almost said) *Consciences* too; such as *stand in need of it to help their frequent infirmities*, restrain their popular and desultory levity, to set bounds of *Discretion, Decency, Charity and Piety to their extravagancies*: and brands their powrings out of their souls to God, (without the *Common-Prayer-Book*) with the ugly Notions of *flat, dull and undevout, deadly tedious, of a confused length, like a Skain of Yarn course and snarled, sometimes so dubious, between wind and water, sence and Nonsense, faction and sedition, boldness and blasphemy, &c.* Is it not time when this Gentleman thinks not fit to speak all this, with much more such stuffe, in the *Syriack Tongue*, but upon the walls, in the face of all *Israel* in the *English tongue*, to make some reply, to let both him and the world know, That though we have not so learned Christ, as to render *reviling for reviling*, nor dare pretend to an ability to give the *Bishop* word for word of this nature, but shall willingly allow him *proestatie* in that Art and Practise; yet we do humbly conceive our selves able to give some reasons of our present forbearance, which may possibly be judged *good and sufficient*, if the Reformed Churches may be our Judges, and not such of our Brethren at home, whose only desire is to have an occasion against us, and know not how to find it, in those things which concern the Worship of our God.

VI. If, indeed, any of us have *heretofore used it, and are still satisfied in our Consciences both of the lawfulness and expediency of it*, yea and were disposed immediately to have used it, before the Declaration of his Majesty came forth, in case we had been required to it according to Laws in force, rather than for default to have been punished (as the *Bishop* suggests, p. 4. Or if any of us thought the iterated use of the *Lords Prayer*, the daily repeating of the *three Creeds*, the *ten Commandments*, the *Confession of sins* and the *Church-Catechism* not only *wholsom and convenient*, but also *necessary* (as he hints, p. 2.) and that in the *Common Prayer-Book*, there are only some *verbal defects, obsolete words, &c.* that need emendation, and we have only forborn the use of it, because his Majesty hath had a *compassionate eye to some mens infirmity*, then indeed the forbearance of it, as to such *Ministers*, may be judged what doth become *judicious, sober men*; but not knowing any such, we cannot but look upon these as most false and unworthy suggestions, designed to no other purpose, than to beget in his most Sacred Majesty an ill Opinion of *able and conscientious*

fcientious Ministers, who (as shall God willing hereafter appear) have other more grave and momentous Reasons to assign, why they have forborn the use of it, not only in whole but in part; yea, though possibly they formerly have used it, it not being impossible that either something may have intervened since their former use of it, which may have rendred the same practise now in their judgments unlawful, or that upon the fuller disquisition of the questions about the use of *Imposed Forms* in the general, or these in particular, they may be convinced, that their former practise was their error, not after conviction to be returned to.

VII. We shall therefore speak, that we may both free our selves, and before the world excuse those of our Brethren, who are of the same mind with us, either in whole or in part, leaving what we shall say to be duly considered by all sober Christians, and submitting our selves to the candid judgment of such persons as shall desire to make a judgment of persons and things, according to a Rule of Righteousness and Reason.

C H A P. VIII.

The first Reason of divers Ministers not using the Common-Prayer. Their dissatisfaction as to the imposing of any forms universally. Divers reasons of that dissatisfaction.

I. **I**T is not clear unto us that it is lawful for *all persons*, and at all times to *limit themselves* by any *stinted forms* of prayer. Where God hath given a gift of prayer to his Ministers, we cannot but think it is their duty to improve, and use it, if indeed God hath denied that gift unto any, or by his providence any way hindereth the exercise of it, we (as was said before) do not doubt but such persons, or any persons at such times, may help themselves by a form; but where God hath given any that gift, we conceive it is a manifestation of the Spirit given him, to profit others by. and that he is defective to his duty, that doth not use it to that end; we are yet to learn, that it is not as lawful to impose forms of Sermons upon Ministers, as forms of prayer; both of them, are lamentable restraints put upon the gifts of God bestowed upon his Ministers,

1 Cor. 12. 7.

Ministers, to that very end, that by the use of them they might be profitable unto his people.

II. We are sure it is the *unquestionable duty* of every one that prayeth, to do it with *the highest intention of mind imaginable, and with the greatest fervency of Spirit*, and that it is not lawful for any man in prayer, to allow himself in any thing, which may either divert his mind, from the most *fixed contemplation of God, or intention upon his duty*, or which may any way cool the *heat, and fervency of his Spirit*. We cannot be induced to believe that any one can possibly so keep his soul *fixed upon God, or so intent upon God* whiles he *reads a Prayer*, as while he *speaks* it from his own conception; we find by experience (not to determine positively of the frame of other persons Spirits) a great difference in the intention and fervency in our Spirits, when our words in prayer are directed, and determined, by the *inward heat, fervency, and affection of our hearts*, from what is, when our words are determined for us, by other men, yea by our selves before the time of prayer, vve humbly conceive, that every Christian stands bound, not onely to look that there be an habit of fervency in his heart, vvhich at all times should dispose it to duties of communion with God, but that a particular fervency should attend the *act of Prayer*; If we durst boast of the former, yet we find the latter certainly hindered by a prescribed form, and we do believe this may be experienced by any person's speaking to a man for his life; vve do not think it possible for any man to have, or shew the like *affection and fervency in reading a Speech* which another hath made for him, no nor in what he hath made for himself, before that time; as he may by such words as the present sense of his condition in that moment of time shall dictate to him: nor have we ever heard of *any malefactor* at the bar that brought his Speech for his life in a form, if he did, we believe there was (even by the hearers) discerned a vast difference betwixt such speeches, and such as a person speaks at that time, to whom a lively sence of his condition, dictates words in that hour.

III. Nor can we believe, that any Minister praying in any form *useth so rational, and experimented a means to affect his hearers hearts, as he who useth none*. As in preaching there is a certain lively efficacy of the voice which every hearer discerneth, more in the Preachers speaking *ex animo*, then from his *reading a Sermon*, which is past denial evidenced, though it be not so easie to say what it is.

So that a Sermon, yea an *ordinary Oration* so spoke, moves and affects the hearers, infinitely more, then a *Sermon*, or an *Oration* read out of a paper (though it be never so well starcht up with *Oratory*, and set out with the highest advantage of an *Oratorial* reading tongue) so we believe, and find it in the matter of prayer; and in very deed, the reason of this we conceive lyeth much in this, because the Speaker himself is (discernably) not so much affected in *reading*, as in *speaking*. 'Tis one thing for the heart and affections to precede the action of the tongue, and to set it on work; another thing, for them to follow the tongue, and be commanded by it.

IV. Speaking is an immediate act of the Tongue, but commanded by the Soul; the Tongue is but the Souls Organ, by which it exerciseth that power which God hath given it, and it cannot be so well performed, as when the Soul that directs, performs its work by dictating immediately to it. So that much of the Spirit and life of prayer is lost, in praying by forms.

V. Nay lastly (to add no more) if there were nothing else in the case, we should think it very disputable, *whether it be lawful for us in the publique worship of God, especially as to the momentous acts, and parts of it, to do that for which we have no command in the Word of God, no president, or example*, and we cannot but think, that the holy *Psalmist's* variety of prayers, and the variety of prayers, which we find used by the several Saints, and holy pen-men of Scripture (none of which as to words and phrases agrees *per omnia* with another) should rather teach us, that when we go unto God in prayer (observing the general rules of prayer laid down in the Scripture) we should take unto us words *de novo*, as God shall put them into our hearts, then borrow words from others, hardly fitted to our hearts, or present necessities. If any have not ability to do it, we conceive it is his own fault, and it were far more consonant to the rule of Gods Word, that such should be removed from Gods Altar, then that the gifts of God bestowed upon others for the benefit of his Church, should be restrained for their sake, which we think would be something like his act, who cut the man fit for the bed, because the bed was not fit for him. Certainly in all congruity of reason, if the Church be *pestered*, and must needs continue so, with a generation of men, who either through ignorance, or through a wofull neglect to *stir up the gift of God in them*, cannot pray without a book, and for their sake,

a Liur-

a Liturgy, or *stinted forms in prayer* be necessary, yet from hence cannot be concluded any *lawfulness*, much less *necessity*, that those, to whom God hath given other abilities, and another spirit, should be obliged to use it, or that it should be imposed upon them.

CHAP. IX.

The Ministers second Reason, drawn from the disputableness of the lawfulness of using any Forms of humane composition, formerly defiled, by use in an idolatrous service, conjoined with the scandal of many Christians arising upon that account.

I. **B**UT suppose we were satisfied, that it were lawful for Ministers of the Gospel to use *Forms of Prayer*, and that at all times, and that this were no stifling of the gift of prayer, no diversion to the intention of our minds, nor abatement to the fervor of our spirits, nor to the affections of our people (to do any thing apertly tending to any of which, is simply unlawful) yet there are particular reasons which appear to us cogent enough, as to the restraint of us from the using of this form.

II. We cannot but have some doubts *whether it be lawful for us in the worship of God by an act of ours to offer up any thing to God* (of meer humane composition) *which hath been once offered in an idolatrous service*, especially when our Brethren say unto us, *This hath been so offered*; That the worship of the Church of Rome is idolatrous, grossly idolatrous, we hope no sober Protestants will deny, their *Veneration of Images*, *Adoration of the Eucharists*, *Invocation of Saints* are all idolatries. Some of these are done as oft as their *Mass-book* is used; so that their worship, *toties quoties*, as it is performed, is idolatrous, though not in every part, yet in the complex.

III. We do observe how some Prelatists mince this point of the *Idolary of the Church of Rome*, they can grant (with much ado, we believe) *that the worship of the Church of Rome is in some sense idolatrous*; what their sense is we cannot tell, nor care to inquire, we believe, that, except some few Pagans who might terminatively worship the *Sun and Moon*, as thinking those noble
Creatures

Creatures were the very *first movers* and *principles*, That never any heathens were guilty of more *stupid* *satish* idolatry, then the *Papists* are. For (let vain persons talk what they please) it will never enter into our thoughts that either the *Fems*, *Jeroboam*, or *Michal*, thought their Images the first principles of life and being, (such as reason teacheth to all that God must be) nor yet that the Egyptians,

— quibus nascebantur in hortis
— Numine.

(who worshipped any plants, or any thing, from which they had good or hurt) thought that these things were God. They onely dreamt that God was *Anima mundi*, the Soul of the World, informing every living thing, and worshipped an *unknown* God in the creature, or by some created representation, (which is yet gross and accursed idolatry) and such is the Popish worship.

V. Dr. Caution on the
Lords prayer.

IV. VVe are not so silly, as to think, that the *holy Scriptures* (dictated by the Spirit of God) or any thing else of *purely Divine Institution*, is capable of corruptions, and therefore cannot but with some laughter read the argumentations of them, who argue, that if vve reject the *Liturgy*, because the idolatrous *Papists* used it, vve must also refuse the *Scriptures*, and the *Lords Prayer*; these are but toys, to blind common people, who cannot see to the bottom of an Argument. The holy *Scriptures* are incapable of pollution by any idolatrous service.

V. Their answer is as silly, who tell us, that then vve must use none of our *Churches*. VVhen vve offer up *Churches* to God by any *rational act* vve will consider of this frivolous answer, which indeed may concern them that dream of a holiness in them, by reason of *dedication* or the like: it concerns not us, who onely use them as convenient places, in which vve meet to serve God, and believe them no more holy then any other places, though the Law of Nature obligeth us to keep, and use them decently. VVe do so by our parlours where vve converse with our friends.

VI. Prayer is a piece of Gospel Sacrifice, and by a rational act of our souls to be offered unto God, now whether it be lawful for us, when *the earth is the Lords and the fulness thereof*, whereas God hath given us an ability, to speak words in another form; to take those very forms, and to offer them up to God in true Gospel worship, which have been offered in an *idolatrous service* (though the

the matter of those forms be not idolatrous) is to us a great doubt: nor can we be satisfied in the lawfulness of it.

VII. The ground of our scruple is in that known Text 1 Cor. 10. where the Apostle treateth concerning the lawfulness of eating meats, that had been once offered to idols. He determines as to a double case. 1. *That it is not lawful to eat such meats in an idols Temple.* 2. In case it be sold in the shambles, and we know it not, he determines, that we may buy and eat it. But in case our Brother saith unto us, *this hath been offered to an idol*, he saith, *Eat it not*. So that our Brethrens scandal upon such a foundation is to be avoided by us, he gives the reason, because there is other meat to eat. *The earth is the Lords, and the fulness thereof.*

VIII. For our part, we are not able to fathom a reason, why a form of words fitted up for use in prayer, should not be liable to the same corruption, and pollution that a dish of meat fitted for natural use is: or why it should be unlawful for one to eat the latter, (if once offered in an idolatrous service, our Brother minding us of it) and it yet be lawful to use a form of words in prayer (so formerly used) when our Brother is so scandalized.

IX. We are aware of what the Drs. of Aberdeen said of old to prove that the scandal of brethren, weighs light, when put in the scale with the command of Authority. There may something be said for their Assertion, where the scandal is meerly passive, and hath no foundation in re, only men are offended, because they are offended: but where the scandal is such, as is so far allowed by Scripture, that a Negative precept is given upon it, *eat it not*, we are not of so easie a faith, as to believe what they say, when Gods word saith *do it not*. Man cannot oblige our conscience to do it, he may oblige us to suffer, but not to act; and that this is the case is evident. Our Brethren say to us, *These Forms have been offered up in an idolatrous service*, and we know this is truth.

X. The Bishop of Exeter is mistaken therefore in suggesting, that we forbear the using of the Liturgy out of a little point of reputation, amongst some people (rather weak then wise, and to be pitied more then imitated, and he shews little charity, or candor in saying we sacrifice our judgements (not to say our consciences) to our credits, and out of a fear or lothness to offend some people, whom we might easily convince and satisfy as well by our examples, as by arguments, &c. This is not spoken like a tender and a good Christian. We hope we can say, we value our reputation at a low rate in comparison

of our duty. Nor do we think *non-conformity* the way to credit now, but that our people's souls (of which we confess we are tender) are *more weak then wise*, we cannot say. Wisdom lies in avoiding sin, yea the least sin, and *all appearances of evil*. That here is an *appearance of evil* no reasonable person can deny, it is not so clear that we may do that as to *forms of prayer*, which the word expressly forbids us *as to a piece of meat*, nor is it so clear to us, that we may obey *man* in any case, where the Word of God saith as to the thing commanded, *Do it not*.

XI. In the mean time we think those *are to be pitied*, who had rather that their brethren should be all *persecuted, imprisoned, banished*, together with those *thousands* of godly people, (who cannot in conscience worship God *with these forms*) differences in the Church perpetuated, and that so many thousands of sober people, should have such a temptation, to entertain hard thoughts of their Magistrate, &c. In short who had rather confound *heaven and earth*, and scandalize *all Christians* in the world, then lay aside *forms of prayer* of pure humane composition, and that in most corrupt times, and only retained upon the *reformation* to quiet peoples spirits, and which (in their own confession) have for 6. or 700 years before the reformation, run through the filthy sink of the *Romish Synagogue*. When God hath himself told them, *That the earth is his, and the fulness thereof*. And therefore expressly charged us not to use a piece of meat once offered to idols, when our brother tells us it hath been so polluted.

XII. But it may be some of our Fathers, or Brethren (what ever a company of us *Puritans* do) do not think the Church of *Rome* an *idolatrous Church*, nor her worship *idolatrous*, we have heard of diverse that have lately questioned it. We confess for those *Protestants* that are of that mind, our Argument upon this head signifies little to them, but we are of another mind in the principle, and therefore 'tis no wonder we have different thoughts of the Consequents. In the mean time, those who believe the Church of *Rome* *idolatrous*, have reason to think of this Argument: Those who judge her yet an *undefiled Virgin*, we suppose may have a desire to be married to her. And we shall hardly be able to forbid the banes.

XIII. VVhen the *Bishop of Exeter* can satisfy us, That the worship of the *Church of Rome* in the whole Complex is not *idolatrous*, Or that it is lawful for us, to take *forms of prayer* of meer humane compo-

composition so used in an idolatrous service, and yet continue them in the true worship of God. Gods VVord saying to us, as to meat so used, *Eat it not*. Or that it is lawful for us to tell our people (when they come and tell us, *Sirs, They say this is taken out of the Mass-book, will you use it?*) *No brethren 'tis not taken out there*, when we know it is. I say, when his Lordship can satisfie us in these things, he may then conclude (which as yet he doth very uncharitably) *That we might easily convince and satisfie our people, as well by our Examples as Arguments*. Our people are a plain kind of Country people, that are not to be satisfied with a *flamant* tant of high words, they have their Bibles, and having so plain a Scripture by the end as that of 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Eat it not*, they choke us with such things as these. Is not the *Romish Church Idolatrous*? have not they used the same forms in their idolatrous devotion? how can you then use them without sin? So that we profess we cannot answer them. VVe desire the *Bishop of Exeter* would do it plainly and solidly.

CHAP. X.

The Ministers third Reason, Because they have sworn to endeavour a Reformation in worship, and to endeavour to Extirpate Superstition, and what hindereth the power of Godliness.

I. **B**Ut further yet to let the *Bishop* know, that it is not out of a meer *Anti-Liturgical humour* that some of us (taking the advantage of his Majesties Declaration, and laying hold of his Grace and Favour in it) do not yet meddle with the Book of *Common-prayer*. VVe desire his Lordship to consider, *That we have taken the Covenant*, and are afraid to bring upon us that vengeance, which we are sure first or last will follow perjury. If his Lordships *loosing St. Peters bands*, could have loosed our *Consciences* from that, we had been a step nearer then we are, but we observe no truth of Divinity in the *Principles*, which his Lordship, and others, have laid down; from which they would conclude, that the bond of that *Covenant* is dissolved; we also discern, his Lordship, and the others abundantly answered by Mr. *Crofton*, and *Timorcus*, and could wish that when any of them write again upon

that Subject, they would not onely assert positions, but give their reasons which may evince the truth of them, or else annex some Scriptures to prove them; or at least tell us, what Divines were ever of their mind.

II. We have in the Covenant sworn to endeavour a *Reformation of the Church of God in England, in worship according to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches.* We think the *worship of God in England*, is, as to the *Rule and Form* of it, expressed in the *Common-prayer Book*, and the *Forms of devotion* there expressed and imposed: We cannot find that either according to the *Word of God*, or the *example of the best Reformed Churches*, it is lawful for the Ministers of the Gospel to tie up themselves to *forms of prayer*, nor that such practise is commended to us: nor can we conceive how the use of the *same forms of Worship* should be a *Reformation in Worship*. Nor (possibly) is it clear to every one, that there is nothing in those forms of worship favouring of *Superstition*, or that the use of them is consistent with the promoting of the *power of Godliness*; at least, that it is a due means to promote it, all which we have solemnly sworn to *indeavour*; and surely that *indeavouring* to which we are sworn, will at least oblige us not to do any thing to the contrary.

III. Into which Covenant many Ministers of the Gospel having entred, since they used the said forms of prayer; something may be said on their behalf, disobliging them from a return to their former practice, though in these last 20 years time they have learn'd nothing from the many books published to the world, examining the said *forms in special*, or offering arguments against *imposed forms in the general*, convincing them of a former inadviseness, and error in practice. If they then looked upon the use of those forms as *indifferent*, surely the *Oath* they have taken puts it into another capacity. If they now judge the *use unlawful*, (it is no great wonder considering how much light hath shone upon the world in that space of time, that some of their judgements should be altered) the *Bishops* charge of *Schismatical petulancy*, restiveness, morosity, &c. cleaves not to them.

IV. If the *Bishop* sayes they had before subscribed to use it: According to his *Lordships* doctrine, and some others of his mind, *forced ingagements* signifie nothing. It is true the Godly Ministers of *England* are of another mind, they believe, though they were *under a force*, (either they must subscribe, or loose their
lively-

livelyhoods, yea loose the exercise of their Ministry) yet they are obliged by their Act, in case it doth not appear to them, *That it is sinful for them to do what they inadvisedly set their hands to*; but that is the Case. Besides, though they cannot think that any Earthly power can discharge them of an Oath made to God, yet they believe that the *Parliament of England* can discharge them of an Engagement entred to an inferiour *Magistrate*, and by Oath again bind them to do the contrary; and that's the case again.

V. If any say, *That the Ministers of England are bound by the Law of England to use the Common-prayer Book*. Besides that it is a great question how far the Laws of a Nation can oblige the conscience in matters of Divine VVorship, and most certain, that they cannot oblige any mans conscience, to do any thing in the worship of God, that is, either directly, or by consequence forbidden there, we make it a great question whether the Common-prayer Book be established by *Law* or *no*, and believe the contrary. That the *Common-prayer Book* 5. & 6. *Edw. 6.* with some alterations made 1 *Eliz. 2.* was so established we know, but what that book was, or where it is, we cannot tell; it is apparent that the books ordinarily walking up and down are not so established.

VI. Suppose it were, we do not think that this is pleadable in the Case, against the *Covenant* agreed by *Lords* and *Commons* legally assembled in Parliament, and so far ratified by the King, as unquestionably in conscience would suffice to discharge any that shall keep it; (though contrary to some former *Act of Parliament*.)

VII. Nor can it enter into our thoughts, that the *Parliament*, or any power under Heaven, can by any future Act, discharge us from the obligation of an Oath; for our parts, those *Divines* that talk any such things, seem to us little acquainted, either with the word of God, or with the nature of an Oath. Not with the former, for God expressly *Numb. 30.* determines the Oath *established for ever*, if the husband of the wife, or father of the child, either at first consented, or did not presently dissent but hold his peace; nor with the latter, for all *Divines* determine it, in the power of men to ingage men in an Oath to God, but not in their power to discharge them again, because the Oath makes us debtors to God, and it belongs to God alone to discharge us; which especially holds, where the matter of the Oath is such as Gods Law required, and for which an Oath is onely a security,

and certainly such is the matter of *Reformation*, and the rooting out of *Superstition*, and the promoting the power of *Godliness*. The Powers of the world in such a case may contract guilt to themselves by forcing such as fear an Oath, to suffer, because they durst not violate their Oath; but they can never lay hold on mens Consciences by any Act of that nature, so as to make them sinners, if they do not *actively obey*: Nay it is far better in such cases, and in all cases, to obey God rather than men.

CHAP. XI.

Other Reasons why divers Ministers are not satisfied, as to the Use of the Book of Common Prayer.

I. **C**ertainly in reason, if a *Lyturgy*, or Form of Prayer be commended to any Church, it should be such a well composed and compleatly digested Pattern of Prayer, as should contain in it the sum of all things to be ordinarily *confessed*, or *begged*, or for which *thanks should be given*; and this drawn up, in such plain expressions, as should be obvious to every hearer, and yet so handsomely, as should reconcile the hearers reverence and attention to it. The *Confession* should be of the guilt of all *Original sin*, as well *originans* as *originatum*; the guilt of *Actual sins*. The *Petitionary* part should consist of *Petitions*, for a *sight* and *sense* of sin, *Faith*, *Justification*, a *sense* of it, *Regeneration*, &c. And all these should be in such a form, as no Hearer should have a reasonable exception to.

II. Thus we are sure it would best fit two (if not the only) ends for which there can be any pretence of the necessity of a *Lyturgy*.
 1. The *acquainting of people with the Doctrine of the Church*, as to things necessary to be believed, and the *prevention of Errors*.
 2. The *helping the weakness of ill accomplished Divines*, who are not able *ex tempore* so to pray in a Congregation, by which means possibly their people never hear a just *Confession of sins*, nor put up perfect Supplications.

III. Now it is possible that if the Bishop of *Exeter* (who hath indeed a rare art at words) may have liberty to comment upon our *Lyturgy*, he may prove, that such as understand as much as himself,

himself, may from our *Lyturgy*, fancy such a perfection of Form, and by Arguments and far-fetched consequences, make out all these; but surely none can say, that take the *ordinary Prayers* appointed to be read every *Morning Prayer*, or *Evening Prayer*, they do contain all things requisite to be *confessed* or *petitioned* for, in so plain and familiar expressions, that ordinary people can understand, that in those Prayers we confess the guilt of *Adams sin*, *Original sin*, &c. or *petition* for such things as are absolutely necessary: Nay we believe that if they did, some that are great *Zealots* for the use of them, would not so well like them.

IV. Besides that the *matter of some things* in the *Lyturgy* is not in our judgments so approvable; we do not understand with what truth we can say to God *eight daies together* that he sent his Son to redeem us, [*as on that day*] nor yet as to any one particular day. Nor yet how we can pray in Faith to be delivered from *Lightning*, *Tempests* and *sudden death*; we understand how we may pray in Faith to be delivered from the evil of these temporal judgments, and from the judgments themselves (*if it be the Lords Will*, &c.)

V. We by experience find, that the *Form* of the Service prescribed in the *English Lyturgy*, is such to which the *Spirits* of sober people are no waies *reconcilable*; who cannot understand what foundation is either in Scripture or right reason, for the using *particular Prayers* for each day, or dividing the *entire Service of God* betwixt *Ministers and People*, or for using so many *shreds*, or *ends of Prayer*, or repeating the *Lords Prayer* so often. Nor can we our selves be more satisfied with it. Mr. *Sparrowes Rationale* in this case to us seems to have as little reason in it as *Durantis* his *Rationale* hath for all the superstitious usages of the idolatrous Synagogue of *Rome*.

—Et cantare pares, & respondere parati.

Neither of the Barrels have in it better Herrings.

VI. Now for us (being so graciously indulged by his Majesty) to scandalize all those people whom we must scandalize, seemeth to us not lawful, considering how tender St. Paul was of giving offence to brethren (how light a matter soever be now made of it) especially considering the observation which we make, which we cannot say is universally true, but as to our Congregations is generally true, and that is this; That many of the persons offended at

our

MS
mark

our forbearance of the *Lyturgy*, are not of the *stricter*, but the *looser* sort of *Professors*, such as his Majesty hath justly stigmatized in his *Proclamation*, as *vicious, prophane and debauched persons, Drunkards, Tavern-haunters, Health-drinkers, Swearers*, not that they are all such, but ten for one we find to be such; and we as generally observe, That those of our Parishioners, who fear an *Oath*, who live *chastly, temperately and soberly*, and by any *Rule*, are generally not desirous of the use of the *Lyturgy*, where they have a Minister of any abilities: But where we have any persons, that give up themselves to strict exercises of Religion, that *pray in their Families, exercise themselves in the Scripture*, and have any great knowledge of *them*, we find them generally impatient of it: Now we cannot think it lawful for us, to scandalize the far greater number of strict Christians, that we may gratifie a few others, in whose lives we find nothing, but what is a far juster scandal to all good men, than a godly Ministers forbearing the use of the *Lyturgy* can be to them.

VII. Especially also considering, that we see, that that sort of people who are so zealous for the *Lyturgy*, so dote upon it, that it is clearly become their *Idol*, they think there is no serving of God without it, no need of any serving of God but *with* it: With many people we see it demonstrably true, that if a Minister should never preach the Word of God, yet if he did but read the *Common Prayer*, it would be enough. The Preacher makes their heads to ache. Now we cannot judge it lawful for us upon this view of the state of our people, to nurse them up in these conceits, which are hardly Christian.

VIII. Yet it might go far with us, if one of fourty of those people that are so fond of the *Lyturgy*, could but give us a reasonable account, why they desire we should pray by *Forms*, rather than *without*, why by *these Forms* rather than others. VVe do not think it lawful for us to satisfie the irrational humours of people, contrary to our light.

IX. By all this, the Bishop of *Exeter* may see, that we have something to say for our selves, why we do not use the *Lyturgy*: Not to enter into a particular examination of the parts of it, the woful Translations of Scripture in it, the irrational cutting of verses from verses, Chapters from Chapters, with 1000 other things, would we examine it in parts, which hath been already done by many: VVe profess our selves for these Reasons to forbear it,
and

and to judge our selves obliged in conscience to forbear it. VVe acknowledge it in his *Majesties* and *Parliaments* power to punish us for that forbearance: If they shall think fit to inflict any punishment in that case, we acknowledge it our duty to suffer patiently, committing our souls unto God as to a faithful Creator: In the mean time, we are humbly thankful to his *Majesty* for declaring, that *none of us shall be punished for the not using of it*, (at least not for a time.) VVe do not forbear because his *Majesty* gives us leave, but we forbear out of *Judgment* and *Conscience*, and bless God, who hath put it into the heart of his Most Excellent *Majesty*, to forbear punishing of us for *Conscience sake*, as to this matter of our God. It is therefore a spiteful & odious representation, which *Bish. Gauden* hath made of us, which hath no foundation of *Truth*, nor mixture of *Charity*. God grant him better Interpreters of his Actions, and require him not according to his dealing with his Brethren, who desire to fear the same God which he professeth to worship, and to walk by the same Rule which he professeth to own. *Happy is he that condemneth not himself in what he allows.*

We shall shut up this Discourse with a summary Recapitulation of what Reasons are scattered in the preceding Sheets, justifying our Practise in the forbearance of the use of the Common Prayer.

CHAP. XII.

A Summary Recapitulation of the Ministers Reasons.

I. **V**Ve cannot believe that it is lawful for all of us, at all times, by limiting our selves to a Form of Prayer, to smother the Gift of Prayer, given (we hope) to some of us, or to cool the heat and fervency of our hearts in Prayer, or the Affections of them that hear us.

II. Because we can find no Precept for it in Gods Word, no Pattern of it there, but one (pretended) Form, that made by Christ himself, although we doubt whether ever it were intended for a Form of Prayer or no, and rather think it a direction for the matter of Prayer; one *Evangelist* saying no more, than after this manner, Christ and his Apostles leaving no Record of their using of it; may few of the

the *entire phrases* in it to be found in other Scriptures. (Dr. *Causabon* in his late Book, is miserably put to it to parallel the *phrases* of it, as any indifferent Reader will judge) yet it being holy Scripture, we doubt not but we may use it in the Form, which is so short, as we may easily get it by heart, and not employ our souls (at our eyes in reading) while they should be wrestling with God: And the divine authority of it is such, as it hath another manner of influence on our Spirits in using (as all the Scripture hath) than can be pretended for any other Forms: And by the length of it, we easily understand, that it was never intended to be used without any other Prayer, to say nothing of many other Arguments might be used for that.

III. Because we cannot find, that *there was ever any Forms of Prayer used in the Church, in any part of it till 400 years (or very nigh) after Christ*, nor any made (for more than some single Province) till 600 years, and then by that superstitious wretch Pope Gregory, and not imposed till 800 years after Christ, when all manner of Corruption was brought in; and we challenge all our Adversaries, to prove what they say to the contrary of this in any Christian Church: For what Dr. *Causabon* saith, of Forms of Prayer used by the Heathens to their Idols, and by the Jews in their most corrupted, depraved estate, it deserves no Answer.

IV. Because we cannot *imagine any use at all of them, or any good they ever did, especially when imposed*. They were first invented to cure the *negligent and ignorant Clergy*, to prevent *Herefie and Schism*; we have shewed, that in stead of this, they have made an ignorant and negligent Clergy, that they are neither a scriptural, nor rational means to prevent Herefie, that they have been the Mothers of *Herefies*, causing *separations*, and constantly brought forth dreadful *Persecutions*, and will do so still in reason.

V. Because we cannot think it *lawful in the worship of God, to use forms of Prayer* (which are compounds made by men) which have once been offered in an Idolatrous Service (such as is that of the Church of Rome) Dr. *Causabon* saith nothing, in telling us, the Scriptures are in the Mass-Book, they are no humane Compositions, nor capable of defilement. Though in these Forms there be no Idolatry, yet they have been used in a *Service grossely Idolatrous*. There the Question lies; not *whether we may use nothing which hath been offered to Idols, or in an Idolatrous Service?* That's a Foppery to dream: but, *Whether it be lawful for Christians in the spiritual Worship of God,*

by

by a rational act of theirs, in devotion to offer up what is of pure humane composition, and so may be altered, and which hath been before defiled, by being offered in an Idolatrous Service abhorred of God. Let our Brethren speak to this Question, and leave speaking to other things, as our using the same Scriptures and Temples: For the latter, they know so did the Primitive Churches, which yet never used the Pagan Forms of words. This is not to speak *ad idem*.

VI. Because we have sworn to endeavour a Reformation in Worship, and the extirpation of Superstition, and what is contrary to, or may hinder the power of Godliness.

VII. Because of the infinite scandal which we must give to some of our Brethren that durst not use it, and to thousands of our most judicious, holy, strictly living Christians; and we durst not offend those little ones, though we dare leave our Ministry, if Authority will command one or the other.

VIII. Because we see the number of those, who are judicious, sober Christians who desire it, is very small, but the generality of those given up to all manner of looseness, prophaneity, and debauchery, are impatient for it, and rest in it, ('tis as the Papists Beads to them) and they care for no other worship of God, and we conceive it far from our duty, to harden any in what we know is their sin and wickedness.

IX. Because we are assured in our Consciences, that very many of those in our ordinary Congregations who are earnest for it, press the use of it, upon no other account, than from a Principle of malice against godly Ministers and People, and desire it for nothing else, but that they may have a weapon to destroy all religious persons by; this is evident by experience, when some Ministers have used some part, they are yet as zealous to turn them out, finding fault, they do not read all; then, he doth not wear the Surplice; he doth not pray the Canon Prayer; he doth not say Later Service. Nor can we get of them any reason why they desire we should use it, only 'tis established by Law, (which we cannot believe) If it were, we think in matters of Gods worship something else must be considered.

X. Because the Forms appear to us very short of a perfect Model of Prayer, full of obsolete words, dubious phrases, antique responds, and such a Method (through the whole) as is like to none in any Reformed Church in the world, nor any where to be parallel'd, but in the Roman Missal, nor any way suited to the spirits of Christians,

stians, not to the gravity of the duty: We do not say this is so, but to us it appeareth so, and therefore it is *ἡμῶν κοινόν*.

XI. Finally, we do not conceive the *Interest and concern of words in Prayer* such, that there is any need at all, that *Forms* should be starcht up for all to use, those being best, which the best affected heart emitteth, and venteth, and which best affect the hearts of others: If all Ministers be not able to pray decently enough, (as to expressions) and suitably enough, as to the Matter, it is because the *Governours* of the Church take not that due cognisance of Ministers Abilities, which they ought to do before they ordain and admit them; Or do not so watch over their Churches as they ought to do. Let then the Errour be mended, by the greater Care and Vigilance of Church-Governours, not by the restraining the Gifts of God bestowed on any, for the sake of some.

XII. This is the Summe of our Apology; which we humbly submit to the Judgment of all that are concerned in the great Affairs of the Church; alwaies reserving to our selves further Liberty of adding any further Arguments or Exceptions, professing ourselves most heartily willing to hear any Arguments of our Brethren, either for *Forms of Prayer*, to be universally imposed, or for these *Forms in particular*, to which we shall give a reasonable Answer, or yield our Cause. In the mean time, we protest against Dr. *Causabons* uncharitable Judgment of us, That we do it to oppose our Brethren. We can, we dare do nothing against the Truth, but are ready to do all for it. But we dare not resist the Light of our Consciences. And if it be the Will of God, that for our Conscience sake in this thing, we be laid aside as *useless Vessels*, we humbly submit to his pleasure, who is able of *stones to raise up Children to Abraham*; and we shall pray that our Brethren may have nothing on our behalf charged upon their souls in the day of Christ. In the mean time, what Dr. *Gauden* hath said, we will further consider in a few words in the following Chapters.

CHAP. XIII.

The most of Bishop Gaudens Arguments for the use of the Lyurgy, examined, and shortly answered: Some of them retorted, proving Violentum's in Logick.

I. **D**R. Gauden hath so perplexed his Discourse with words, and been so careless of Method, that we have found it no easie thing to pick out his Arguments; we could have wished, that like a Logician and Divine, he had proposed his Arguments strictly, and followed them closely, that we might have judged that his Design was with a strength of Argument, in the Spirit of Meekness, to convince us, over whom he so provocatively insults, not merely to confound his Reader with a non-significant Rhodomantado of Phrase.

II. So far as we can gather, he one while argues for a Lyurgy, by and by for this Lyurgy, and no other; for which he one while argues, from the Obligation of the Law, another while, from the Obligation of the Example of the Primitive Churches, or of some Persons now living: By and by he urgeth the use of it from Gratitude to his Majesty, and from the contrary Evidence of Ingratitude, Morosity, Peevishness, &c. in case of Refusal. One while he prerends an incomparable excellency in it, another while, the blameableness of it: Anon he runs a descant upon the Confusions of our Church since it was neglected. After this, he tels us of the Necessity of it, the necessity of a Lyurgy for the planting of any Church, this Lyurgy, for the defending of our Church against Popery. One while he urgeth it, that we might be conformable to our Prince, another while, that we may be Loyal. He tels us of the Authority of the Church, as to Lyurgy, Ceremonies, what not? He justifies, not only the Forms of Prayer, but also the Method, the Responds, yea, the Musick, the Ceremonies, the Catechism in the Common Prayer-Book: One while he tels us, that men have served God day and night in the use of the Lyurgy, yea, that he is perswaded St. Paul himself (had he been alive) would have used it; another while, he tels us, how some Ministers and people have bewailed the neglect of it.

O quo te teneam mutantem Procea vultu ?

The Dr. had made our work shorter and more methodical if he had told us, which of these he accounts *arguments* in the case, and which he looked upon as strains of *Rhetorick*, onely as to which we needed not have troubled our selves with an answer; he not doing this, we must examine them all, supposing that the Dr. took all these for *conclusive Arguments*, in the case able to command reasonable, and religious souls to this conformity.

III. For the pretended *Antiquity of Liturgies*, his Lordship may gather from what is already said, that we do not believe any such thing, nor hath he spoke one word to prove it, we living not in *Pitthagoras* his School, have not learned to submit to an *Arbitrariety*; we desire him to shew us any authority for a *Liturgie* within the first three *Centuries*.

IV. As to what he saith p. 2. That his most *Sacred Majesty* in his *Gracious Declaration* hath not dispensed with the legal, morall, *obediential*, obligation. We conceive he means the obligation which lies upon mens consciences to observe the *Civil Laws of the Nation*, we do not else understand his meaning.

If this be it, the Dr. hath two things to do; 1. To prove that the *Common-prayer Book* (vulgarly to be had) is established by any *Law of England*. (we heard it was openly denied in the house of Commons in the last Parliament, and we cannot find any Law to that purpose, the Laws 1 *Ed. 5* & 6. *Ed. 6*. & 1 *El.* are such, that our consciences tell us, they daily violate the Law that read these books.) In the mean time we ingenuously confess, That his Majesties *Declaration*, as it cannot make an *obliging Law*, so it cannot dissolve the obligation of it: but where is the Law? 2. If it could be found, how far doth it oblige any mans conscience? certainly not to any act of sin; if we thought we could use these forms without sin, we should never dispute the Law in the case, but freely obey the least intimation of his *Sacred Majesties* pleasure.

V. For what he tells us p. 8. of the example of the Church since the first *Century*, we can find no such thing. VVe have said enough to that c. 3. It is an empty unproved Assertion, though we know nothing but *Gods Word* obliging our consciences, and are to learn that any examples oblige us (but those of Christ and his Apostles) and therefore for what he tells us p. 3. of some Ministers that have all this time used the *Liturgie*: Others that lately have reassumed the

use of it: it signifies nothing to us who live by the unerring rule of Scripture precepts and *presidents*. If others will sin, surely it obligeth not us to do so too: Though we dare not say they did, or do sin in it.

VI. He urgeth it upon us next from an ingenuous Argument, viz. *Gratitude to his Majesty for his indulgence*. To which we answer, That we with all humility acknowledge His *Most Excellent Majesties gracious indulgence in it*. And in point of gratitude, are willing to serve his *Majesty* with all that is dear unto us (our souls only excepted which we know he desireth not) in token of thankfulness to his *Majesty*, we are ready to part with any part of our *livelyhoods*, and shall in that vye with those who pretend most to his *Majesties* service, (though many of us in several places have no benefit by his *Majesties* Declaration, whiles some eager *Lawyers* and *Justices*, still give the *Statutes in charge* against us, and cause us to be indicted and prosecuted, openly telling the people that the *Kings Declaration is no Law*, though they also know that there is *no Law for the Common-prayer*) yet we have an experiment of his *gracious Majesties* good will to us his poor Subjects; and shall be unwilling by any way, which our consciences tell us would not be sin to us, to let his *Majesty* know our *gratitude*. But we are sure that his *Majesty* is more charitable to his peoples souls, then to desire that to express their thankfulness to him they should commit the least sin against God. And this is enough to excuse us from the *Bishops* rash charging us with *Morosity*, *Restiveness*, *Peevishness*, *Schismatical petylancy*, &c. with none of which men can be charged for any action which they do, or neglect, that they may avoid the guilt of *Sin* before God, whether their consciences inform them rightly or no.

VII. For the many Splendid words, which the Bishop useth p. 23. 31. to daze peoples eyes at the apprehension of the *Excellency of the Liturgy*, they are of nouse at all, for besides that if he would have made his words good, he must have proved 1. *That the Common-prayer hath in it a perfect Confession of such sins as all are guilty of*. Original, Actual, of Omission, Commission, a perfect summary of things necessary to be begged of God for all: and a perfect form of thanksgiving for mercies received, and all this expressed in most Significant Scriptural Language, plain, and affective expressions; and cast into a lovely, and usual method, I say besides this, the *Excellency of no form of words in prayer*, can commend it to
be

be imposed universally, if such imposing be not lawful. But in stead of this the Bishop gives us a parcel of fine words without a title of proof, and contrary to the general apprehension of all *Reformed Churches*, (who never spake it more then tolerable) and to the *judgement of discretion*; which the Protestant Religion allows to all private persons: so that this is but *κρυπτα δόξα* one Drs. opinion, which to us *Protestants* is not enough to make what he sayes, a *probable Doctrine*.

VIII. What he argues for it, from the *invalidity of the exceptions taken to it*, and the *supposed unblameableness of it*, signifies as little, for it is blameable enough, as a *form universally imposed*. 2. As formerly *used in an idolatrous service*; and for many things which he never so much as indeavours to vindicate it from, though told him of old by Mr. *Cartwright*, the *Abridgment*; more lately by the book called *Necessity of Reformation*, by *Vavasor Powel*, &c. besides for what he speaks to, as to the point of *Baptismal regeneration*, it is so without *foundation in Scripture*. (for all know those two Texts 3 Jo. 5. and in *Titus* have other and better senses.) So contrary to the *Analogy of Faith* in the point of *Justification*, *Perseverance in grace*, &c. and the Dr. hath said so little to clear it, that those *Exceptions* will yet stand good, so will that as to the *translation of the Text* in *Ezech.* for none is so simple to assert, that we can as infallibly give the sense of a Text, and put it in other words with our additions, as *Christ* and his *Apostles*; and sure we are, the Text in *Ezech.* in the letter of it speaks no such thing as our *Liturgy* makes it to speak.

IX. For what he urgeth as to the *disorders, and confusions in our Church since the disuse of the Liturgie*, which he much comments upon p. 7, 18, 40. It is no argument to evince the necessity or expedience of bringing back the *Liturgie* again, because not the want of it, but rather the too long having of it, was the cause in a great measure. For 1. *In what Congregations were these confusions most ordinary?* was it in those Congregations where the *Liturgie* was out of choice laid aside? which were furnished with Godly Learned Ministers? we appeal to the *Citizens of London* whether they took notice of any such *extravagancies* in their Ministers? nor can malice it self so charge them. But there were two other sorts of Preachers: 1. There was an *old Set* who had so used themselves to the *Liturgie*, that they had lost *all their gifts*, and being restrained in the use of those forms, and not having a *spirit* or

V. The Common-prayer book unmaskt.

V. The Paralel between the Mass-book and the Liturgie.

heart

heart futed to their work could do just nothing. 2. There was another Set of *Lay-preachers*, and *raw young Students* got into livings, many of whom were also corrupted in their judgements, and it is no great wonder some of them should be justly chargeable. The question is, what such confusions there would have been, had none been admitted into livings but such as were duly qualified.

X. Above all things we wonder, why a form of words in prayer at the administration of the Sacraments, should be judged so highly necessary to be prescribed; for the Sacrament of the Lords Supper as it is an Ordinance which requires the greatest preparation, both as to him that administers, and those that receive: so we cannot but think it very hard that any diversion should be offered to the Ministers soul in prayer there, and unreasonable that he should do any thing which might either abate the fervor of his own spirit, or be less affective of his peoples hearts. For the forms of words in Consecration and Administration, we think it no way fit the Minister should vary a tittle from the institution, where Christ hath left us words sufficient. Nor can we allow the Liturgie's turning the words to be spoken at the delivery of the Sacrament into a prayer, being no wayes agreeable to the Institution. The same is to be said as to the other Sacrament, onely if an explicit enumeration of the chief heads of the Doctrine of Faith, (to which the Parents assent is required) be judged necessary, we think it warrantable, and should freely allow the Church to prescribe a form there, and to enjoin the observation of the Scriptural form of words in both administrations to be used, and no other.

XI. As to the desires of the most Learned and Judicious, and Godly of the people, which the Dr. mentions p. 7. we see no such thing, but the quite contrary, and dare almost venture it upon the vote of such in our Parishes, as are not guilty of noted debauchery, and have any form of Religion in their families, and can give us a rational answer why they desire it.

XII. We do freely allow that no Minister ought to oppose his private Spirit to the Spirit of the Prophets united: but yet must maintain for every Minister a judgement of discretion, (which when we have once disputed out of the world, Popery will immediately succeed, & nothing remains but blind obedience) we do allow a due honour to some of those Reverend persons that had an hand in composing the Liturgie, and do think they did worthily in their generation, according to that twilight of Gospel light, which immediately

mediately after a midnight of *Popish darkness* shone out upon them: we do allow them to have done *prudently*, respecting the State of the English Nation at that time, (*Rome* could not be pulled down in a day) but we also know, how imperfect their *attainments* were, and how *gradually* they reformed their own judgments. It is sufficiently known that one of the most Eminent of them, (holy *Cranmer*) was one of them, who (at that time himself being a professed Protestant) condemned that rare *Martyr Lambert*, for denying the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. In the witness of which truth in *Queen Maries* dayes himself (upon further light) suffered Martyrdom. We believe he did both in the sincerity of his heart, and onely mention this to shew, that those *Eminent lights* were not fitted to set a standing and perpetual rule to the Church in so great an affair as this is.

XIII. But if as the Bishop saith p. 3. Neither *piety* nor *policy*, will allow the *discomposing* or *dissolving* the whole frame of the *Liturgy*. And if as he tells us p. 12. *The Reformed part of Religion cannot be well preserved in England to any flourishing and uniform State, unless such Liturgy be authoritatively enjoined, and constantly maintained*. Then unquestionably it ought to be as he dictateth. And if as he tells us p. 23. *The Liturgy of England as to the main essentials of it in Doctrine, Devotion, Consecration, and Celebration, for matter, order and method, be such as may not be maimed*. If (as p. 31.) *nothing can ever be seen comparable to this Liturgie, if it be milled and destroyed, and if after it be reviewed, it be not by Law, reestablished and authoritatively enjoined, Truth and peace can never be established; there's all the reason in the world that we should have it, better that those thousands of Godly Ministers and people, who cannot submit to it, should be banished the Land, then such evils come by hearkening to them, or such good things be hindred by their non-conformity*. But let us search the bottom of this heap of words, & see what strength of *Reason* there is in them.

XIV. He gives three reasons for his former assertion; *That it is against piety and policy to alter it*.

1. *It would reproach the wisdom, and blemish the piety of the first composers of it.*
2. *It would imprudently disparage the judgement and devotion of the whole Church of England.*
3. *It would much damp and discourage the present zeal and devotion of the greatest and chiefeest part of this Nation, who are much pleased and profited by the use of it.*

Ergo

Ergo, The alteration is against Piety and Policy.

XV. For the first, We would be loath either to reproach the Piety, or blemish the wisdom of the first Reformers; but we cannot understand how the one or the other should be reproached, by not imposing a *Lyturgy*, or not imposing this *Lyturgy*. Was the Wisdom of God reproached by the dilute of the Ceremonial Law, which yet was an excellent Schoolmaster to bring the Jews to Christ? Or is the wisdom or prudence of William Lilly or any other Master of Grammar reproached, because when the Boy comes to be Master of Arts, he no longer makes *Latine by Grammar Rules*, nor further useth it than at a pinch now and then? Certainly those first Reformers did like wise and pious men, with respect to their age, the complexion of the People, the abilities of the then-Ministers. But if that we have not improved both in Reformation and in all Gifts, very much since that time (now 100 years) we have woefully abused our mercies. And it is the honour of our first Reformers, that by their means who first translated the Service-Book into English, &c. there are so many thousand Ministers to be found now in England, who are able to speak unto God before people, as well and orderly, as if they did read those Forms. Is it not so to the Schoolmaster, who by dictating Forms of *Theams* and *Epistles*, and *Orations*, teacheth his Boyes to make as good, and better than his were, in 9 or 10 years time? Surely it were rather a reproach to the Schoolmaster, so to inure his Boyes to Forms, that when they are Masters of Art, they must still have Forms dictated to them, without which they can do nothing.

XVI. Nor would the alteration of this *Lyturgy*, and not imposing any, blemish the Judgment of our whole Church, our Kings, Princes, & Parliaments, &c. Their Judgment was excellent as to those times. In King Edward his time, the Clergy were generally *Popish*, and had they been left to Liberty, would certainly have used the *Mass*, or else such persons as were of mean parts, most of them *Anglice docti*, such as the necessity of those times required, because better could not be had. In Qu. Elizabeths time, the state of the Nation (at least in the beginning of her Reign) was little better; witness the Record which Archbishop Parker left, (and is yet to be seen in the Library of Corpus Christi Colledge in Cambridge) of all the Ministers in his Province, and their several abilities, where are 20 *Anglice docti*, such as understood no Latine, for one that hath a Character for any Learning set upon him; this man was

K

Arch-

Archbishop in the Second year of Qu. Elizabeth. Undoubtedly it was an Act of rare Judgment for the Parliament then to *impose Forms of Prayer*, nor was it likely that suddenly the whole Nation would be reformed so well, that with any security or prudence, the Ministers could be left at liberty. Since the time of Qu. Elizabeth no Parliament meddled with it: King James indeed reformed it in part, and declared his Judgment for it. King Charles (of Glorious Memory) in his *Meditation* upon the *Lyrurgy*, (though indeed he judgeth an imposed *Lyrurgy* lawful, and this as to the main very good) yet declareth his readiness to have consented to *amend what upon free and publick advice, might seem to sober men inconvenient as to matter or manner*; by which it appears, that his Majesty judged it capable of amendment both as to *Matter and Manner*.

XVII. But it is a great Riddle to us, how the *amending of the Lyrurgy*, and not *imposing any universally*, should damp and discourage the zeal of the greatest and chiefest part of the Nation, who find much pleasure and profit in the use of it. For if it be still left at liberty to them, if they please to use the old Forms, how is their Zeal *damp-ed or discouraged*, by the liberty which others take? It is a fiery Zeal in men certainly, that must needs have all others to be of their humour, as to the use of *Forms of words* in Prayer. If by *zeal*, the Bishop means the *Fury* of people against those who durst not use those Forms, the God of Heaven more damp and discourage that zeal, which we are sure is not according to knowledge. If the greatest and chiefest part of the Nation be so zealous in this case, doubtless if they be left to liberty, people will generally fall in with those Ministers that do use it, and there will be an *ingenuous conformity*, which is alwaies best; for a little experience will convince the *furious ones* of this age, that Religion is a thing that must *instillari*, not *intrudi* (as Beza sometimes said) a thing to be gently instilled and commended, not bluntly and forcibly intruded and compelled. Our Bishops in this point may give counsel effectual to the *filling of Goals*, undoing of many thousands, and procuring their cries unto God against them, but never effectual to accomplish their designs, if indeed their designs be to bring all to an uniformity in this thing. But they very well know, that if it be left to liberty to Ministers, to use or not use the *Lyrurgy*, that experience will quickly make it appear, that the greater part of more knowing and zealous people are not so enamoured upon it, as they proclaim them to the world to be.

XVIII.

XVIII. In the next place, he tells us, *The Reformed part of Religion cannot be well preserved in England without it, to any flourishing and uniform estate.* Immediately before, he told us, *Religion could not any where be planted without a Lyturgy.* Both of them, Propositions of equal truth. If Religion could not be planted without a *Common Prayer-Book*, it is a wonder that the Apostles and Pastors of the *Primitive Churches* missed this only means: For what *Lyturgy* was ever heard of in the Church for 400 years after Christ? (the great planting time) if the *Reformation of Religion* cannot be preserved without a *Lyturgy imposed*, or this *Lyturgy*, alas for the Churches of God in *Scotland, Holland, France, Geneva!* If they have a *Lyturgy*, how unlike is it to this? Nor is it imposed, nor the use of it, by penalties compelled; yet blessed be God, the *Reformation* in those Churches is not less perfect than ours, nor less firmly preserved: Let their Confessions of Faith be read, or their printed Books against the Papists be read, and compared with ours, and let all judge: What singular thing then is there in the Constitution of men and women in *England*, that *Religion* in its *Reformed part* cannot subsist without the authoritative imposing of a *Lyturgy*, taken out of the *Roman Missal* (as to the far greater part?) Surely none will say, it is because the *Reformed Party* of *England*, have a more reverend opinion of *Pope Gregory* and the present Church of *Rome*, than the *Reformed Party* in other Nations hath: This indeed were a shameful reproach to the Church of *England*. Let her Enemies lay it to her charge; but let her true Sons spend their time in covering such nakedness. We must know the *Bishop's* Reasons, before we can believe any truth in this, especially when we know that those Ministers and people, who are most zealous against *Popery*, are most averse to this *Lyturgy*.

XIX. The Bishop instanceth in the matter of the *Sacrament*, telling us, *Popery* can never come in while the Form of *Consecration* prescribed in the *Book of Common Prayer*, which is most ancient and excellent is used. We must ingenuously confess, that some Forms of Prayer prescribed to be read at the administration of the Lords Supper, are very good and pious; but we are much of his mind, who said, *Nihil ego puto a quovis prescriptum tam exacte, quin addi aliquid possit, aut perfectius reddi, a quovis qui ministeris dignus, ad docendum vel movendum affectus, nam facile est addere inventis & prescriptis, & licet forte nihil exactius dari posset, tamen languet oratio, ubi non est verborum varietas, nec prorumpunt affectus interiores orantis*

Altare Damasc.
P. 6, 13.

aut exhortantis liberè in verba. Nam ut afficiat auditores, oportet ipsum affici, non autem afficitur ut debet, qui semper eisdem verbis orat, aut exhortatur. It is an usual saying, and may be true enough, *Optimus Orator non nondum nascitur.* To say that either for matter or phrase there was never any Prayers made like to those, and that no such can be made, are strange, extravagant, and hyperbolical expressions, by no means either to be justified or demonstrated. In short, those Forms of words in Prayer are undoubtedly best for the *Speakers use*, which come most from the intention of his mind and fervency of his Spirit. As to others joyning with him, those are best, which most affect the Hearers hearts. That these, or any Forms upon this account do so, is not demonstrable. For the *Form of Consecration of the Lords Supper* in the *English Lyturgy*, we cannot find any *Form* for it (which we think an *high Omission*) we do conceive, that the Consecration should be by *reading the words of Institution, taking, and breaking the Bread*, and then *blessing it*: We find only a *Form of Prayer* for a *Blessing* upon the Elements, and not so much as a *Rubrick* directing the Minister at that time to read the words of *Institution*, or to *take and break* the Bread. As for the words used in the *delivery of the Sacrament*, we find them (without any warrant from Gods Word) turned into Prayers: So that the Bishop might have spared the commending of this Part of the *Lyturgy*, where we think is a more considerable *Omission* of what should be there, than he can instance in, in our *administrations*, or then the omission of those words, *Receive the Holy Ghost* in *Ordination* is, especially when we know no such power any Ministers have now to give the *Holy Ghost*, as the Apostles had, and can easily distinguish between the Apostles ordinary Act in *Ordination*, and their extraordinary Act in *giving the Holy Ghost*; to the latter of which, none can now pretend. For the *Ancienry* of these Forms, we have shewed it before, they are not of age enough to speak for themselves, and to plead their *gray hairs* for their continuance.

XX. To say, *That without the authoritative imposing of this, or any other Lyturgy, Truth and Peace can never be established*, is irrationally guessed, nor can there be any pretence for it: Certainly truth is far better preserved by a *full and sound Confession of Faith*, in a *Form of sound words*, in which all are agreed, and we should be content to read a short summary of it every Lords day, to subscribe, own, defend it; that it should be subscribed and sworn by all

all Commencers in Universities, by all to be ordained, or admitted into livings, by all admitted to Sacraments; how an imposed Liturgie should do half so much, nay how it should do any thing at all to preserve Truth, we cannot guess.

XXI. For Peace, we have had the experience of an 100. years to prove the contrary; sure we are that we may thank the *Imposing of the Liturgie* in former times, for all our *Brownists, Anabaptists, Quakers, Familists, Sectaries* of all sorts. Their Leaders first separated from the Church for the *Common-prayer Book* and *Ceremonies*, then set up for themselves, and being themselves unskilful in the Word of Righteousness, easily perverted others. And we are sure that there are now 100. for every one that distasted these things in 1640. both *Ministers* and *people*; how the reimposing should bring us to Peace poseth us to prophecy. It may bring many thousands of persons to ruine, for not conforming, driving them into other lands, giving their malicious adversaries advantages to fill prisons with them; but Peace it can never bring.

XXII. We observe that all *Reformed Churches*, where are no such imposings of *Liturgies*, have more plenty of able Divines, (considering the proportion of their ground) more zealous defenders of Truth, fewer *Hereticks*, and *Schismaticks*, then ever England had at any time when the *Liturgie* was most rigorously imposed. Nor is it reasonable to imagine that we should ever have any peace in the Church, if the former *Liturgie* be imposed, but continual separations from the Church, and violent prosecutions of those whose consciences for the reasons aforesaid, will never allow them to use it.

XXIII. So that we humbly crave leave to retort this as an Argument against the *Imposing*, either this, or any other *Liturgie*, Its being inconsistent with the peace of this Church. And we most humbly beseech His most Excellent Majesty, the Noble Lords, and the Gentlemen of England, seriously to consider, Whether there being no command in Scripture; nor particular warrant for any imposings of this nature; no president of the primitive Church in any part for 400 years after Christ; there being also such a plenty of Godly able Ministers in England; So many times ten thousand of Godly Christians, who cannot allow themselves in the worship of God by forms of prayer; and who have taken so great a scandal at these forms in particular, and that for reasons above mentioned: It can consist either with Piety in them to enjoin what

what is so *highly offensive*, (when St. Paul professeth so much tenderness to his *weak brethren*) or with *Policy*, to enjoin that in which they cannot but know that many thousands will be found who durst not actively *Obe*, but will think themselves bound to suffer? So that they will be constrained in pursuance of their *honour* (commanding such things) to *erect Courts*, *direct prosecutions* of persons, only blameable in this matter of their God, and such who are ready by any *Act* or *Oath* to secure their *Allegiance* to his *Majesty*, by any *Action* to express it, *paying tributes*, and *customs* for conscience sake; daily *praying* for all the *blessings of heaven and earth* for his *Majesty*, and this with far more cordiality then others *drink His healths*. Or whether such proceedings be like to produce *Peace* in the Church, or rather everlasting *divisions*, *animosities*, and *constant prosecutions* of sober *Christians*, concerning the equity of which the *Just Judge* of the whole earth must one day enquire? And in the mean time these *Impositions* to be of no further considerable use, then to help *ignorant persons* unfit for the Ministry, and such as are *lazy and negligent*, and make no conscience to *stir up the gift of God* in them. We humbly leave this to our Superiours to determine.

XXIV. The questions as to piety are, 1. *Whether pious Magistrates, can according to principles of piety, command and enforce those things, which Gods Word doth not command in his worship*, being openly *offensive* to multitudes of Godly people? 2. *Whether they can acquit their soules to God in making Laws, to fine, disturb, imprison, banish, &c. multitudes of their Subjects for no other crime then this, that they cannot limit themselves to forms of prayer in Gods Worship?* And suppose these two things were consistent with Piety, yet whether *Policy* would direct it? is another question; why should so many good Subjects be lost to a Nation? why should they have temptations to estrange their hearts from the ancient and excellent government thereof? But matters of policy, we most humbly leave to the grave wisdom and deliberations of His Sacred *Majesty* and His *Parliaments*. Onely we must add a word to one or two Suggestions more, which the *Bishop* hath for the imposing of the *Liturgie*.

CHAP. XIV.

Bishop Gaudens two Arguments, from the Authority of the Church, the influence of Subjects Conformity, in devotion, to their Prince, considered. No necessity of using the Liturgy upon these accounts.

I. **T**He truth is in other parts of his Book, the *Bishop* did but like the *Lapping* fly far about from his main design and argument, which p. 27. he toucheth, and yet but very tenderly. *The Authority of the Church must not be baffled.* Here indeed is the bottom of all, we must have *Liturgies* and *Ceremonies* imposed, to maintain the *Authority* and pomp, and grandieure of what they call the *Church*.

II. The name of the *Church* is a reverend name, and her *Authority* is reverend, and by no means to be baffled, for *Christ* is in her. But, as the *Name* and *Authority* of a rightful *King*, is reverend, so both the name and authority of an *Usurper* is justly abominable. And as no *Magistrates* command is to be obeyed where he hath no right to command, so neither is any *Church*; nor is denial of obedience in that case any contempt of the *Authority*, either of the *Magistrate* or of the *Church*; we must therefore enquire strictly what *Church* this is which is clothed with *Authority*, and what power she hath in the things we dispute about?

III. The *Church* is either *Triumphant* or *Militant*. The *Militant Church* is *visible* or *invisible*. It must be the *Militant visible Church*; this also is an *homonimous term*, and either signifies the *universality* of the people, or the *messengers* of the people. The *Universality* of people baptized into the name of *Christ* over all the world, make up the *Catholicke visible Church*. The whole Company of them in this or that *Province*, *Nation*, *City*, *Parish*, make such a *National*, *Provincial*, or *Parochial Church*. But we do not think this is the *Church* clothed with *Authority*: We understand by a *Church* in that sense, The *Officers* of such a *Church* constituted according to *Gods Word*, whether they be the *Officers* of a particular *Church*, or the *messengers* of the particular *Churches*, in a *Legentile Synod*, a *National* or *Provincial Synod*, or (if it were possible) in an *Oecumenical Synod*. To *Churches* in all these political senses we

ow great reverence, and acknowledge that to their several capacities, several degrees of authority, to admonish, suspend, excommunicate, deprive, declare the doctrine of faith in doubtful cases, appoint some things truly and properly relating to decency or order, &c.

IV. But it is more then we know that any such Church as this, ever established a *Liturgie* in *England*. The Papiſts have devised a new notion of a Church, to them the *Pope* and his *Cardinals* make the Church; but that any such notion of Church is justifiable from *Scriptures*, *Protestants* deny.

V. Our State, hath been pleased in some *Acts of Parliament* to take Church in another notion, and to call the *Prelacy of England*, the *Church of England*. That this application of the term Church is not to be justified from *Scripture* or *Reason*, is plain; nor is it needful: they may if they please, call the *Prelacy of England* the *Parliament*; or by what other name they please, what should hinder? But they cannot give them that *Authority*, which the word of God allows onely to a Church in another notion; but may cloath them with what civil power they please.

VI. Hence it appears, that it is all one with us in *England* to baffle or despise the Church and State; for that company of men whom we call the Church of England (by a new civil application of the term) is nothing else, *Then a company of men by a Civil Power made Bishops, and called to advise the State, in things concerning Religion; who have no more Authority then they derive from the King or Parliament, for whence should they have it? Not from Nature; Surely no Ecclesiastical power is derived from thence; Not from Scripture upon any pretence, for if when Christ gave the Keyes to Peter, he intended his single person as the Papiſts would have it; then St. Peter's successor only can pretend to them, if he gave them to Peter, as an Officer of the Church; then there must be either a full Convention of such Officers, or some persons chosen by them to use them: If to Peter as a Christian, then the Authority is in the Community.*

VII. It remains, that according to the Constitution of *English Synods*, the Churches Authority is but derivative from the *Civil State*; and to disobey them, is no sin, further then it is a disobedience to the lawful *Civil Magistrate*, to whom we freely grant an authority, so far as Gods word allows us, and such an authority as none ought to resist or baffle, (as the *Bishop* sayes.) The Church

Church of England, which we so often hear of, is a *Civil Church*, not an authoritative *Church* in a Scriptural notion.

VIII. We again say, Far be it from us to oppose *Civil Authority*, either exercised by *Lay persons*, or *Ecclesiastical persons*. We acknowledge it our duty to render unto *Cesar*, the things that are *Cesars*. We further say, vve are bound to obey the *Civil Magistrate* in all things, in things lawful, *Actively*; in things unlawful in themselves; or vvhich appear so to us by suffering their vwill, and pleasure, quietly and patiently. That vvhich vve insist upon, is onely a lawful means in order to our own preservation: i. e. humbly desiring the *Civil Magistrate*, to forbear imposing upon us in the tender things of God.

IX. VVe freely allow to the *Civil Magistrate* a power to command us in all civil things, and shall chearfully obey him. 2. To command us to keep the Statutes, and Commandments of God. 3. To command us in the Circumstances relating to Divine Worship, to do those things, vvhich are generally commanded us in the vword to appoint time and place, and such circumstances vvhich the vvorship of God, in the judgement of ordinary reason, must be indecently and disorderly performed.

X. For his power in imposing *Forms of prayer*, significant ceremonies, &c. vve do not dispute it, but vve humbly crave leave to dissent in this, and to have liberty to suffer his pleasure as becomes Christians, rather than do those things vvhich our consciences vould condemn us for. And in this vve appeal to all sober Divines, and all rational Christians, vvhether vve speak not as becomes sober Christians.

XI. VVe cannot vvitout some passion read vvhat the *Bishop* sayes p. 28. "Doubtless Subjects cannot be so tire and firm, or so zealous and firm, or so chearful and constant in their Loyalty, love, and duty to their Sovereign, if they either think themselves commanded to serve God in a vway worse then their Princes use, or that their Sovereign and Prince serve God worse and less acceptably then they do; certainly the greatest honour, love and safety of Kings, is from the fameness of true Religion vwith their Subjects, as to the main.

XII. VVhat an excellent Doctrine this is, if it were true, to engage the *King of France* against all his *Protestant Subjects* from whom he differs as to Religion in the main? yet are they as loyal to him as any other; doth the *Protestant Religion* teach disloyalty

towards Princes, differing from their Subjects in the main of Religion? We desie such Doctrine, and all the Assertors of it.

XIII. Doth it infer a difference in the main of Religion, because our *Sovereign* thinks fit to use Forms of Prayer, and we use none? Is this a Language worthy of a Divine? Is the *Mode of Worship*, and the *Main of Religion* the same thing?

XIV. How shall they think themselves commanded to use a better or worse Religion, upon whom nothing is imposed at all? which is all we beg; and against which the Doctor argues.

XV. How doth the *Prince* and his *Subjects* in this case (the first using Forms of Prayer in publick Devotion, the latter none) more differ in the main of Religion, than the Christians of two Families in a Parish do, where the householders so far differ each from other? Or how shall they differ more upon this liberty, than Dr. *Gauden* himself allowes, who would not have all persons in their Family-duties, ryed up to these Forms, which yet are the *Kings* daily Service in his Household.

XVI. To be short, these Discourses are but *ad populum phalerae*, Pretensions in which all the judicious world sees there is nothing of Reason or Argument. *Qui vult decipi, decipiatur*, If God hath so far given up men, that they cannot see it. But notwithstanding all that is, or can be said, the Servants of God who differ from their Brethren in this thing must be brought into a *suffering estate*: The Lord grant them *Wisdom*, and *Faith* and *Patience*, and provide for his people, more able and faithful guides, than we have approved our selves, while we had a liberty to work in his Vineyard; and if it be a sin in any for this reason to forbid us to *speak* to poor perishing souls *that they might be saved*, we shall be so charitable, as to beg of God, that it *may not be laid to their charge*: But we hope, and pray for better things for the poor souls over whom God hath set us.

C H A P. XV.

Bishop Gaudens Arguments for Church-Musick examined. The Novelty of Musick in Churches evinced. Not in the Primitive Church. Not in any Reformed Church. Condemned by Aquinas, Erasmus, and by the Generality of Protestant Writers. The Jews no Pattern for Christians in it.

I. **T**He *Bishop* having spent himself much in devising reproachful terms, for such as are not satisfied in their Consciences as to the use of the *Liturgy*, and arguing for the use of the Forms of Prayer, (that he might leave no part of his work undone) comes to vindicate the *Quiristers*, *Singing men and boies*, and the use of *Musick* also in the worship of God. It is only fit (he saies) for those mens rudeness to abandon Church-Musick, who intended to fill all things with the Alarms of war, and Cries of Confusion: How charitably this is spoken, with reference either to the Purer Primitive Church, or the lately Reformed Churches, or many of his Brethren, the sequent Discourse will evince. We durst not render reviling for reviling, but commit our case to him that judges righteously; and offer our thoughts in this thing to all sober Readers, who understand ought of Ecclesiastical Story, or right Reason.

II. But by what Topicks will this great person prove the Lawfulness of Church-Musick? Did this also come from the first Century? Surely no. For *Justin Martyr* (who lived in the Second Century) lets us know, that the Church then judged it a childish Serving of God, and that it was not received in the Church in his time: His words are these;

*Just. Martyr,
Qu. & Resp.
Resp. 107.*

Οὐ τὸ αἶσαι ἀπλῶς ἐστὶ τοῖς νηπίοις ἀρμόδιον ἀλλὰ τὸ μετὰ τῶν ἀψύχων ὀργάνων αἶσαι καὶ μετὰ ὀρχήσεως καὶ κροτάλων. Αἰὶο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ποιοῦνται ἐν τῶν ἀσμάτων ἢ χεῖρεσσι τῶν ποιόντων ὀργάνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν νηπίοις ἔντων ἀρμόδιον καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὸ αἶσαι ἀπλῶς. In his time there was only plain simple singing used in the Church, and more than that, viz. with instruments of Musick, they looked upon as a puerile, carnal Service.

III. Indeed the *Bishop* fetcheth it high enough; for he agrees

Pol. Virgil l. i.
de inv. rev. c. 15.
Hospin de Ong.
Templ.

with *Durantus*, in making *David* the Author of *Organs*, nor pretendeth he any authority but that of the *Jewish Church*. That there was (even by Gods Institution) *musical Instruments* used in the *Jewish Church*, is not to be denied, whether in the *Synagogues*, or only in the *Temple*, is doubted, the latter believed. But what kind of *Musick*, is not certain: Both *Polydore Virgil*, *Hosfinian*, and many others agree, our *Organs* were not then known in the world. When they first were found out, *Polydore* saies is uncertain; and in his 3 Book, reckons them amongst those things, whose first Inventers are not known. Sure we are *Dauids* Instruments were stringed *Organs*, i.e. *Instruments*, not such as we call *Organs*.

Calvin, Psal.
37.

Willets Synops.
p. 593.
Quare 2 Sam.
in ch. 6. v. 9.

IV. But may we then agree, that what *David* used in the worship of God, we may? Else the *Bishops* Argument from *Dauids* use of *Instruments*, proves nothing: Let us then have *Altars* and *Frankincense*, (which saith Mr. *Calvin*, are every whit as lawful, as *Musical Instruments* in Gods worship.) But surely nothing which was figurative and typical in the *Jewish Service*, ought to be continued by us, which their Instruments of *Musick* were; they prefigured our *spiritual melody* to be made in our hearts to the Lord; the sweet *Musick* also of a *Conscience justified by Faith*, and at peace with God, saith Dr. *Willet*, and so *Zepperus* and others agree. But who knows not, that the Jews had carnal Ordinances, (as the *Apostle* calls them) which we must not imitate them in, who *John 4. 24.* are obliged to worship God in Spirit and Truth.

22e
Aq. sum q. 91.
art 2. resp. ad
3. & 4. arg.
* As both Ca-
jetan & Greg.
de valentia ac-
knowledge.

V. It is as uncertain when *Organs* were first brought into Churches, as when they were first devised. *Marianus Scotus* tells us, that they were first sent of a Token to King *Pepin* in France, in which *Aventinus* agrees, but adds, that they came not into any Church in France, till the year 828, when by the industry of a *Venerian Priest* (*Ludovicus* then King, and willing to be at the charge) they were there set up. *Balaus* tells us, *Vitellianus* brought them in, Anno 660. *Bellarmino* saith, it was very late. What *Balaus* and *Platina* say, that *Vitellianus* brought them in, cannot be true: No, nor what *Almonius* saith, who saith, that *Ludovicus Pius* brought them in, for it is plain by *Aquinas* his determination, (against the use of any *Musick* in Churches, as *Judaical* and carnal) that they were not come into the Church in his time, which was about 1260 years after Christ (which is also well observed by *Cajetan* upon *Aqu.* and by *Navarrus*, in his Manual, &c.

VI. For

VI. For the *Reformed Churches*, they have no *Musick* in the worship of God: In some of their Churches, (as *Zepperus* notes) they have *Organs*, to delight people with at ordinary times, when the worship of God is not performed. The *Bishop* might have been more charitable, both to the *Apostolical Church*, and the *pur-rer Primitive Churches*, and all late *reformed Churches*, than to have determined them guilty of *rudeness*, and a *design to fill all things with the Alarms of war and Cries of Confusion*.

VII. Having no *Scripture*, no *Apostolical* or *Ecclesiastical Tradition* (as they pretend for *Bishops* and *Lyturgies*) to pretend for *Church-Musick*, the *Bishop* is forced to make use of his *Reason* here; the *depth* of which, as also its *Symphony* with that of the ancient *Fathers*, or latter *Divines*, cometh next to be examined.

VIII. We can find but five pieces of seeming *Reason* in the *Bishops Discourse*.

1. *The Angels began the Quire at Christs Nativity*: He is not in good earnest sure to suggest to the world, that the Angels brought any *Musical Instruments* down with them from Heaven: If not, his Argument must be; That it is as lawful for us to praise God in publick Acts of worship, with *Instruments of Musick*, as for the *Angels to rejoyce*. But how shall that appear? We believe no more that the *Angels* taught men (by that jubilation) the use of *Church-Musick*, than the idle story *Socrates* tells us, of *Ignatius* his learning the Method of *Responds*, by a *Vision of Angels*, answering one another, like so many *Quiristers*; which as *Hospinian*, and others say, was not surely such a momentous piece of *Worship*, as that God should send *Angels* down to exemplifie it.

IX. But the *Bishop* tells us, we have as much *cause to rejoyce*, as the *Jews* had: True. And God forbid but we should *rejoyce* with equal joy: But must it be in the same *carnal manner* too? Have we had any *Command* of God (as they had) for any such Service? Why should we not have *Trumpets*, and *blow* with them, as they did too? Yea, and have *Altars*, and *Censers*, and *Incense*, and *Thank-Offerings* as they had? Who is so blind, as not to see through these Paper-Arguments?

X. Thirdly, The *Bishop* tells us, *Musick is a Gift of God*, and it is fit, *God* (in his Service) and Church should have the use of so *Orient a Pearl*. That *Musick* is the gift of God, none can deny, nor yet, that God ought to be served with all his Gifts; But is

The Gift of
conceived
Prayer is a gift
of God. Ergo
&c.

there

there no way to serve God with the use of this his Gift, but to use it in his worship? Are there not 100 other things that are the Gifts of God, of which yet there is no use in the *Worship of God*? The *Bishop* will say (it may be) if we may *serve God* with it, why not use it in his *Worship*? We answer, because *God hath not commanded it*. And it is to set up our *posts* by *Gods posts*, and our *Thresholds* by *his thresholds*. This is enough, but much more might be said, and shall be said by and by.

XI. *Ah!* But he tells us, Fourthly, *It is an exercise that fits the duty of Praise and fitteth mens Spirits in it*: We think, it fitteth some, far better than others, and the *carnal part* of any, better than their *spiritual part*. But we think *we shall never have done, if we stand disputing (after our Saviours perfect Rule given in the Gospel) what is fitting for his House*. Our Saviour knew, that *Musick* was a *Gift of God*, and fit to *exhilarate persons*. And surely when one is dead, his or her relations had need of something to cheer their spirits: Yet we find, our Saviour gives no great countenance to the *Musicians*, nor doth any *Miracle* till they be gone; nor do we find him in the least appointing or countenancing *Musick* in any act of *Worship*: How well it fitteth mens Spirits, we shall hear something by and by, from the observation of others.

XII. But he tells us, that the use of *Musick* in *Gods worship*, is as lawful as singing by *Meeter & Tunes*, as any *Psalmody*, or *Hymnology*: We shall believe this at leisure, because we read of Christs singing an *Hymn*, and of the Apostles directions and *Command*, *Eph. 5. 19.* by which we are obliged to sing *Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, making Melody in our hearts to the Lord*. But never of any *Command* or *Direction* for *Musical Instruments*. We are mistaken if those words, *Psalms, Hymns, Songs* do not imply words cast into a metrical order. *Tunes* are necessary, as *circumstances*, without which, nature it self would teach us, that the performance is *undecent* and *disorderly*, and apparently so to all that should hear.

XIII. But it will not be amiss to take a view of the *Judgment of Divines in all times*, concerning the use of *Musick* in Churches; by which it will appear, what devout, holy and good men have judged of it, or have by experience found true concerning the use of it.

XIV. We shewed before, that *Justin Martyr*, and the Church in his time, judged it a *puerile Service*, and upon that account, allowed it not in the Church; nor can any reasonably expect, that any of the *Ancients* should explicitly declare themselves, against the use of *Musick* in Churches, when it is apparent, that for 900
y ears

years after Christ there was no such practice, yet much may be found in them; from which we may judge what (had it then been come into Churches) would have been their sense of it.

XV. *Lactantius* falls very foully upon the heathen, for believing, That their Gods did love what they affected, and for coming to the worship of God to look upon the Gold of the Temple, the fine Marble and Ivory, the brave Stones, and fine Habits, and for believing that their Temples had so much the more Majesty, by how much they were more gay, and adorned. So that (saith he) Religion is nothing else but *Cupiditas humana*, [mens lust.] men think that must needs please God, which pleaseth them.

*Institut. l. 2.
cap. 7.*

XVI. It is true, Singing was early in the Eastern Church, as we learn by the account of the Christians behaviour, which *Pliny* gives to *Trajan*. But the Western Church received singing very late. *Ambrose* is said first to have used it at *Millan*, when with his Congregation he kept the Church against the *Arrians*, that the night-watchings might be less tedious.

XVII. Let us hear *St. Augustine* speaking, from whence it will not be hard to judge what that Reverend person's opinion was about the singing then used, and its fittedness to the duty of Christians in praising God; it is in his 10th. book of *Confessions* cap. 33, we will translate it for the Reader.

"The pleasures of the ear had entangled, and captivated me, but thou (O Lord) hast loosed and delivered me: now I confess, I do acquiesce in those sounds, which thy Oracles enliven, when they are sang with a sweet artificial voice. Not so as that I stick here, but so as I may rise, when I will. But when they come unto me in the very phrases, wherein they live, they seek in my heart a place of dignity, and I can scarce afford them one fitting for them. For sometimes I seem to my self to give more honour to them (i.e. so sang) then I ought to do, while I discern my heart to be more kindled into a flame of piety, when those words are sang, then if they were not sang. ——— &c. But the delight of my flesh, to which I ought not to give up my mind to be enervated, doth often cheat me, while it doth not so accompany my reason, that it will be patient to come behind it; but because it is admitted for that it endeavours to run before it, and to lead that. Thus in these things, I sin, not perceiving it, but afterwards I do perceive it. Sometimes more immoderately taking heed of this cheat; I erre, (but very seldom)

dom) with too much severity on the other hand, I would have all the melody of those sweet songs with which *David's Psalter* is full, removed from mine and the Churches eares, and what I remember I have often heard told me of *Athanasius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who commanded him (in his Church) that sang the Psalm, so to sing, that he should rather appear to read then sing, seems safe to me. But when I again remember the tears I powred out (at my conversion) at the *Singing of the Church*, and how I am still affected, not with the singing, but with the things that are sang, with a clear distinct voice, and a convenient tuning: I again acknowledge the great profit of this Institution *i.e.* *Singing*. I am thus divided betwixt the danger of pleasure, and my experiment of *wholesomeness*, and rather incline (yet not pronouncing an irrevocable sentence) to the approbation of the practice of singing in the Church, that weaker Souls may by the delight of the eares, be raised up in pious affection. Yet when it so falleth out that the *Singing* doth more affect me then the matter sang, I do confesse that I dangerously sin, and had rather not hear those that sing.

XVIII. See how jealous this good man was of his own, and others hearts, lest the melody of an innocent tune should intice his heart too much from considering the spiritual matter sang; what would he have thought if *Church musick* had been then in date, where he should have heard nothing but a carnal sensual-delighting noise?

XIX. In the next place let us hear St. *Hieron*, (or whoever he was that wrote those Commentaries upon the Epistles of St. Paul, bound up with St. *Hierome*; *Bellarmino*, and *Catharinus*, think *Pelagius* was the author, *Sixtus Senensis* and *Victorius* think it was at least a *Pelagian*) whoever he was, we may learn the sense of the Church about that time. In those Commentaries on *Eph. 5.*

D. Hieron. in
Epist. ad Ephes.
cap. 5. v. 19.

19. — Let those youths and such as sing in the Church (saith he) hear this, That we must not sing unto God with the voice, but with the heart; nor must the jawes and throats of men be pleased with a sweet noise after the fashion of Tragedians theatrical tunes, and songs must not be sang in the Church, but we must sing there in timore in opere, in scientia scripturarum, &c. — Let the servant of Christ so sing that the words which are read, may please not the singer's tone. That the evil spirit which was in Saul, may in like manner now be cast out of them possessed with it, not brought into them, who make a stage of

of the house of God. What would this author have said had he lived in our age? and known our Cathedrals?

XX. Bernard confesseth it as his sin that he often broke his voice to sing more loud, and was more delighted with the tune he sang, then regarded any cordial compunction. *Bernardi med. cap. 11.*

XXI. Pope Gregory saw the abuses of singing crept in early, *Greg. dec. dist. 92.* and anathematized Deacons that should leave their office in preaching or distributing alms, to turn singing men.

XXII. *Daneus* saith, Our singing is a meer corruption of an Ordinance of God, and which hath in it nothing of piety, nor serves for any thing but to tickle the ears. *Peter Martyr* saith, he cannot see how it can be tolerated. *Tilenus* sharply damnable it. *Aquinas* (though a Papist) saith, the Jews Musick was figurative and carnal, and that Musick serves onely for sensual delight, *Aq. Sum. 22. q. 91. art. 2. ad 3.* *Tilenus* saith of it, what we will not English, *Illis arideat qui magna meretrici supparascari potius quam Christiana simplicitati studere malint.* *Pareus* condemns it in his Commentary on *1 Cor. 14. 7.* And so indeed do the generality of Protestant Divines. But least they should be thought too much parties; we will conclude with one who was no Puritan, for we think he lived, and died a Papist, though not resolved to approve all he saw and heard in the Romish Synagogue, without any further account; we will take pains to translate what he saith on *1 Cor. 14.*

XXIII. Upon the *1 Cor. 14. 7.* I had rather speak five words, &c. he thus notes.

"In this business 'tis admirable how the custom of the Church is altered; *St. Paul* had rather speak five words to be understood, then ten thousand [in spiratu] not to be understood. But now in some Countries they sing all day in spirit (i.e. so as none understands them) there's neither measure nor end of singing, when as scarcely in 6. moneths a good Sermon is heard, perswading to true piety (that *St. Paul* calls speaking in understanding) to say nothing, that in the mean time a kind of Musick is brought in too, to the worship of God, that none can clearly understand any voice. Nor have they that sing any leisure to attend to what they sing. Onely a noise of voices strikes their ears, and pleaseth them with a momentary delight. And this might be born, but that the rout of Priests and Monks place all piety in this, wonderfully differing from *St. Paul*; why

"doth the Church doubt to follow so great an Author? yea, how
 "dare it dissent from him? what else is heard in Colledges, Mo-
 "nasteries, Churches, but a roaring of voices? But in *Paul's* time
 "there was no singing but pronounciation meerly. Singing after-
 "wards vvas entertained, but such as was nothing else but a tu-
 "nable and distinct pronouncing of the words. Such as vve use in
 "rehearsing the Lords prayer, and the common people too, under-
 "stood the Language used: now what doth the common people
 "understand but noises signifying nothing? onely a sound strikes
 "their ears? And these things being first received under a specie:
 "or shew of piety, by degrees came to that, that there was nei-
 "ther end, nor measure of *Psalmes, Songs, Anthemes, Dirges, &c.*
 "that we might see they made proficiency. And which is yet
 "more grievous, Priests are more strictly tied to these things then
 "to the commands of Christ. To hear this the people must be
 "constrained to leave their labour, with vvhich they must main-
 "tain their wives and children (what can be more sacred?) Let
 "Churches have their solemn singings, but moderate. But we
 "that are employed in private affairs, must be also compelled to
 "thesethings, and carry about a quire with us in *Ships, Coaches,*
 "&c. And from the observation of these, or the neglect of them,
 "we are judged godly, or ungodly. Let a man be a greater world-
 "ling then *Crassus*, a greater reviler then *Zollus*, yet is he ac-
 "counted a devout man, because he sings service well, although
 "he understands nothing of it. I beseech you vvhat do these men
 "think of Christ, who think he is pleased with such roarings of
 "voice? Nor are they content with this, but we have also
 "brought into Churches, a laborious, and theatrical musick, a
 "tumultuous prating of divers voices, such a one as I think was
 "never heard upon any stage amongst the *Gracians* or *Romanes*.
 "All places roar with Trumpets, Pipes, Cornets, Dulcimers,
 "and with these mens voices are mixed; *Love songs*, and other
 "filthy songs, (to which vvhores and mimicks dance) are heard.
 "Peop'e run to Church as to a stage to tickle their ears; and for
 "this use are bred *Organists*, and *Choristers*, and maintained at
 "great charge: children's age is spent in learning such prating,
 "while in the mean time they learn nothing that good is. A
 "rabble of sordid and light persons is bred, and the Church is
 "loaded with the maintenance of them, and that too for a pesti-
 "lent employment. I beseech you, do but count how many poor
 people

“ people ready to famish, might be maintained with the salaries
 “ of these Singing-men? These things do so please them, that
 “ among the *Brittains* (especially) the Monks do nothing else.
 “ Those whose singing should be mourning, think God is ap-
 “ peased with their lascivious neighings and moveable throats.
 “ For this purpose also, boyes, and striplings, and Artists in sing-
 “ ing are bred up amongst the *Brittains*, for the nonce (forsooth)
 “ to sing a *fine-tuned Song*, and so play a lesson on the *Organs* to
 “ the holy *Virgin-Mother*. And the *Bishops* are constrained at
 “ their houses to breed up and maintain such Choristers. And [the
 “ *Monks*] wholly taken up with these things, never understand
 “ any learning, nor any thing in which true Religion consisteth.
 “ Now those that have thick-pates, and cannot learn Musick,
 “ think they do not do their duty on an holy-day, if they do not
 “ use a scurvy kind of singing, which they call *Fauburdum*, that
 “ neither recites any thing prescribed, nor keeps any harmony
 “ of Art. Add to this, that whereas sober Musick was brought into
 “ the Church, that the thing Sang might more affect the hearers
 “ mind, they think it a brave thing, if one or other of them,
 “ can roar, or bellow so loud, that none can hear a word. In this
 “ they indulge fools affections, and provide for their own bellies.
 “ Why should these things onely please us? which *Paul* would
 “ have sparingly used (according to the fancy of little ones) yea,
 “ which *St. Paul* would never have indured? he speaks of Sacred
 “ reading, not of Stage-play-singing. Let us sing in the spirit, but
 “ let us sing Christian-like, let us sing sparingly, rather let us sing
 “ with the heart, let us speak with tongues, but seldom, let us
 “ prophecy more studiously. Let rather be heard the voice of the
 “ Preacher, reproving the conscience, comforting the dejected,
 “ quickning drousie souls, opening the Sacred Spirits mysteries,
 “ and let tender age be rather spent in these things.

Thus far that learned man, though a professed Papist, concern-
 ing the usefulness of our Cathedral Musick and singing, after he had
 had a large experiment of it.

XXIV. To shut up this Discourse, We say, *That Musick is an*
excellent Gift of God, that God under the old dispensation of the
New Covenant, appointed it to be used in his worship, as *presigura-*
tive (saith *Aquinas*, *Willer*, *Zepperus*.) of our making *Melody in*
our hearts to the Lord under the Gospel, or of that *sweet peace of*
Conscience which flows to the Soul, upon the exercise of Faith in

Christ. Or rather, as one of those *Carnal Ordinances*, which the Apostle saith the first Temple had, *Heb. 9.* as they also had *terrene and earthly Promises* (as *Aquinas* saith.) In the time of *Reformation* by Christ, neither he nor his Apostles used or appointed any; nor did the *Primitive Church*: *Justin Martyr* in his time accounted it *Judaizing*, so did *Aquinas*, within these 500 years: So that it is a perfect *Innovation*, without any pretence of *Institution*, or any ancient *Tradition*, grossely abused to *wantonness* and *Superstition*. The *Magdeburgenses* tell us, *Ambrose* was against all *Musick* any where, *pudicitia gratia*, because he saw it served for lust, for the most part. To maintain the use of it, the Church-revenues were consumed, in nourishing singing Boyes and singing men, *Cheristers*, *Masters of Musick*, *Organists*, and many of these were, and are prophane, beastly persons, and no profit at all arose from it, but the peoples understanding confounded, with insignificant noises, and their ears only tickled with air. People came to Church, saith *Erasmus*, as to a Stage-play, and went away (ordinarily) saith *Hospinian*, as soon as the Musick (for which alone they came) was over. Infinite Sums of money were spent about Organs. *Zonaras* tells us, that *Michael*, Emperor of *Constantinople*, made Organs of Gold; and *Bruschius* in his Discourses of the *Monasteries of Germany*, tells us of an *Abbot* that made a pair of Organs, whose greatest Pipe was 28 Foot long, and 4 Spans about. Upon all these considerations, and after all this experience, and the joynt Suffrage of all *Protestants*, and many sober *Papists*, in condemning this course, what shall we say, to hear a Protestant Bishop pleading for them, and fastning such a charge as he doth, upon all those that would have them removed out of the Church? VVe can say nothing, but, *The Lord lay it not to his charge.*

Chraſtonius
Polonus, in
praxi de Cerm.
& ear. Miſſa
Abes. 41. 42.

XXV. *Andrens Chraſtonius*, a *Polonian*, (who is cited by *Didclavius* in *Alt. Damasc. c. 8.*) thus determines in this case; "It ordinarily comes to pass, that peoples ears (once accustomed to this Musick) disdain to hear the Word of God, and those things which the Church ought to have repeated with the mouth for a testimony of her Faith, and for Edification, are committed to dumb and irrational Organ-pipes. With the Mouth, not with Trumpets, &c. is Confession made to salvation. Whence it is that Divines teach, that these things hinder, not profit Priests according to the Order of *Melchisedech*. That they are more fit for the *Aaronical Order*, the time it self sheweth, where-
"in

“ in they first began to be used in Sacred Offices : For *Bellarmino*
 “ himself confesseth, that they first began to be used in the time
 “ of Pope *Vitalian*, but he brings no reason why none of them
 “ were used either in the Apostles, or in *Constantines* time : For
 “ if they began to be used after the year 660. or 820. we must be-
 “ lieve, that humane nature had a great wrong, in that for so ma-
 “ ny years it did not apply this Faculty to the praise of God. For
 “ we believe the Apostles loved Christ *with all their hearts*. The
 “ former and more religious ages had weak ones too, though no
 “ Organs were used to help them. I know not whether they en-
 “ crease or diminish tediousness : For men seldom see those Mus-
 “ ical Masters godly, and those Instruments with their length, are
 “ troublefom to such as sing with the voice. Let the matter be as it
 “ will, I affirm, that *Bellarmino* with his distinction of *Ceremonies*, could
 “ not answer *P. Martyrs* reason against these. For as the offering
 “ of bloody Sacrifices, though common both to the *Jews* and *Hea-*
 “ *thens*, was taken away by Christs Blood on the Cross, as unsui-
 “ table to the Priesthood after the *Order of Melchizedech*; so though
 “ the Heathens used these Instruments in the Solemnities of their
 “ Idols (as *Nebuchadnezzar* in the Dedication of his Image) yet
 “ these were convenient only for the Jewish, Ceremonial wor-
 “ ship, &c.

XXVI. But the truth is, all that can be pretended for *Church-*
Musick, is the *Authority of the Church*, to add what *Ceremonies*
 she pleaseth to the worship of God ; which we must speak som-
 thing to in the next Chapter : Though neither can *Church-Musick*
 come under that Notion, for it is a perfect Service of it self, not
 alwaies appendant to singing, and is so used, a perfect *Post* set up
 by Gods *Posts* ; an *Ordinance of mans* added to the *Ordinances of*
God for his worship, which our souls shall desire to take heed
 of.

CHAP.

C H A P. XVI.

The Bishops Reasons for the English Ceremonies, considered. The Churches Power about Ceremonies, examined. No Principle to be maintained to death. Archbishop Parkers Opinion of humane Ceremonies. Reasons against them.

I. **V**VE are come to the last thing which we shall take notice of in the *Bishops Book*; and that is his zealous Assertion of the *Churches power in appointing Ceremonies and Circumstances of Divine Worship*: This is indeed the root of all, the *Pandora's Box*, the very *Fountain head* of all these *Impositions*, which have bred so much trouble, disturbance and persecutions in the *Church of God*. Let us first see how the *Bishop* asserts it.

II. He tells us, That the last shock of popular envy which the innocent and excellent *Liturgy of England* was wont to bear, was from the *Ceremonies*. For which, the summe of his Plea is this;

1. That they are few.
2. Retained as signal marks of Faith, or Humility, or Purity, or Courage, or Constancy.
3. Not as Sacramental Signs conferring Grace, but meerly as visible Tokens, apt by a sensible sign to affect the understanding with something worthy of its thoughts, as signified thereby.
4. St. Augustine was no enemy to them.
5. They are established by the *Laws of Church and State*.
6. They fall not under the Second, but the Third, Fourth and Fifth Command.
7. They are like Cloaths, suited to our Bodies, and Perwicks to our Head, and Tunes to our Psalms.
8. They do not burden any Conscience.
9. It is most true, and undeniably to be maintained, even unto the death. That this *National Church*, as all others, hath from the Word of God Liberty, Power and Authority, within its own Polity and Bounds to judge of what seemeth to it most orderly and decent, as to any Ceremony or Circumstance in the *Worship of God*, which the Lord hath left

left unconfin'd, free, and indifferent in its own nature, and only to be confin'd, or regulated, by every such Ecclesiastical polity within it self, &c.

III. We must in our examination of this *Harangue* of discourse, crave leave to alter his *Lordships* method, and to begin with the last thing first; for if the Lord hath left to the Church or State, no such power at large, or if it be bounded by some general rules to be observed in the exercise, which are not observed in some particular impositions, all the former pleas, that they are *few, signal marks*, &c. nor *Sacramental signs*, &c. come to just nothing. Yet we cannot but observe, how the *Bishop* hath provided a way to light upon his legs (say what we will.) For it cannot be denied but the Church hath a full power from the Word of God, within its own polity and bounds, to judge of what seemeth to it most orderly and decent, as to any circumstance in the worship of God, which the Lord hath left unconfin'd, free and indifferent in its own nature. And only to be confin'd or regulated by every such Ecclesiastical Polity within it self. i.e. The Lord hath left that to be regulated by the Church, which he hath left to be regulated by the Church. A most momentous, and undoubted truth! never denied by any. But that is not the question: This is the question; *whether it be the will of God, that the Church should regulate and determine, all things which the Word of God hath left indifferent as to his worship; or, whether God by leaving them indifferent, hath not declared his will that the Church should so leave them too?*

IV. Yet were the first part determined affirmatively, it would not reach the mark, for it would then be queried, *whether the particular Ceremonies appointed for us, be such, considering the letter of the Scripture, or the circumstances of those Ceremonies, with the reason, and consequents of Scripture Text, that they (under those circumstances considered) can be lookt upon as indifferent yea or no.*

V. The *Bishop* is yet confounding us with the complicated notion of the Authority of the Church and State. In England there are no Ceremonies established by any other authority then that of the State, w^{ch} having called together some Ecclesiastical persons, heard their advice, and by a Law established some Rites and Ceremonies, to which no soul is otherwise obliged, then to a State-constitution.

VI. That the Word of God hath left many things (not possible to be determined by it) to the Authority of the Christian Magistrate, cannot be denied; whether any Ceremonies or no, is a que-

a question, diverse *circumstances* relating to the worship of God, are undoubtedly so left. These are such as relate to *order* and *decency*, i. e. without which the worship of God cannot be *orderly* and *decently* performed, and do chiefly relate to *time* and *place*, (the ordinary adjuncts of humane actions.) Thus we freely grant that the *Civil power*, or the *Church* (orderly assembled) may determine, at what hours on the Lords day, the Congregation shall meet, as also it shall determine particular times for *fasting* or *thanksgiving*, as Gods providence shall administer occasions; that places of publique worship, shall be erected, frequented, kept decent, and an hundred things of that nature, which even reason and nature it self teacheth all sober persons to be such, as that without some order to be observed in them, the worship of God, either would not be performed, or would be undecently performed.

VII. But that either any *Church* or *Civil Authority*, shall be absolute judges of *order*, and *decency*, and that whatsoever of this nature shall be commanded by them, shall therefore be judged *decent*, and *orderly*, because they say so; and their commands shall oblige mens consciences in things of this nature, where the word of God is silent, will want some proof before it be credited.

VIII. Or, that they *have power*, to command and *impose such things*, under the notion of *order* and *decency*, which have been grossly abused to *idolatry* and *superstition*, or at which pious people have for a long time declared themselves scandalized, or which have any remarkable appearance of evil in them; is so grossly false, that it needs no confutation, for they themselves are commanded, *To abstain from all appearance of evil, to give no offence either to Jew or Gentile.*

IX. Nor is it true, that they have any authority to appoint *significant Ceremonies*, where are *sensible signs* to affect the understanding. This is to give them authority to institute Sacraments, God hath appointed us *Ordinances*, where by *sensible signs*, *spiritual mysteries* are represented to us. These are his *Sacraments*, we know no authority men have to add to them, though they avoid the Popish rock, of *their conferring grace*, which we say no true Sacrament doth *ex opere operato*.

X. Now for any such *Ceremonies* as these, we crave leave to dissent from the *Bishop*, let them be never so few, imposed under what specious pretence they will, let who will be for them, and let them be established how they will, we believe them reducible

ble to no command, but certainly and justly burthenfom to any tender conscience. No vvaies like clothes fitted to our bodies, (because not any way necessary) nor like tunes for Psalms, because the worship of God might be decently enough performed without them. They may for ought we know be as good as perukes, [or periwigs] to make a specious shew of devotion for them, the baldness of whose hearts stands in need of such things to dissemble them to the world.

XI. If the Bishop thinks that the Churches power to establish such Ceremonies, be a principle to death to be asserted. We dare say he is the first Confessor that Doctrine ever had, and (which God forbid) should he ever seal such a cause with his blood, we should think he deserved no better Epitaph, then, *Hic jacet, Protomartyr Gregorius, cui parem Ecclesia Christiana nunquam prius habuit, nec posthac unquam habeat.* Was there ever heard of any yet that died in the defence of a Churches right to institute in the Church what it pleased, so as it was such as Gods Word did not forbid? Tell it not in Gath, O publish it not in the tents of Askelon.

XII. Let us hear Arch-Bishop Parkers opinion in this case, he lived in darker times, then ours are, but yet it seems had more Gospel-light, or a more Gospel Spirit; he was consecrated 1559.

Having told us of Augustine the Monk's eagerness (even beyond his Mr. Pope Gregories directions) to bring in the Romish Liturgy and Ceremonies in England, which yet he could not do, (without the blood of 1200 Monks that opposed him.) He thus bewailes that first Prelates fury.

"And truly (saith he) that contention then stirred up by Augustine, about bringing in the Popish Ceremonies or Rites, which could not then be appeased, without the blood and slaughter of many innocent Brittaines, hath reached unto our times, with the like destruction and slaughter of Christians. For when men by those pompous Ceremonies departed from the pure simplicity of the primitive Church, they took no great care for holiness of life, for the preaching of the Gospel, for the comforts and efficacy of the holy Spirit, but they raised new contentions every day, about new Ceremonies added by several Popes, who thought none worthy of any great place, who did not bring in some new Ceremonious, (that I may not say) monstrous, unheard of, and unusual thing, and so they filled both Schools, and Pulpits with tales, and brabblings: The

*Antiq. Eccles.
Britan. cap. 17.*

“ primitive Church was more simple, and white, with the intire
 “ and inward worship of God, prescribed in his word; she was
 “ not splendid with garments, nor adorned with magnificent
 “ buildings, nor shining with gold, silver, and precious stones.
 — “ But the Romish Church, even in that great St. *Augustines*
 “ time, was so overgrown with Ceremonies, that he complained,
 “ that the condition of Christians, in respect of the multitude of
 “ Rites, and Ceremonies, was worse then that of the Jews, who
 “ though they acknowledged not their time of liberty, yet were
 “ subjected only to Rites appointed by Gods Law, not to humane
 “ presumptions, for they used fewer Ceremonies, then the Chri-
 “ stians in Gods worship. But had he perceived what heapes
 “ were after added by several Popes, I believe that he, who then
 “ saw the evil of them in the Church, would have set some Chri-
 “ stian bound to them. For we see that the Church is not yet free
 “ from that contention about Ceremonies; but men otherwise
 “ learned, and pious, contend and quarrel about Vestments and
 “ such trifles, in a more brawling, and military, then Philosophi-
 “ cal, or Christian manner. This worthy person would hardly
 have died in defence of a power to appoint Ceremonies.

XIII. But suppose it were not *per se*, unlawful for the State, or Church, to appoint some mystical and significant Ceremonies: yet may all such things be done without any regard at all to circumstances? St. Paul saith, *All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient, all things are lawful, but all things edifie not.* And we have heard such a maxime, as, *Quicquid non expedit, in quantum non expedit, non licet.* Every thing that is not expedient, so far as 'tis inexpedient, is unlawful. St. Paul determined the eating of flesh, and many other things inexpedient, by reason of the offence, and the scandal those things would have given, supposing any Ceremonies to have been used by idolaters; and that the former use of them hath proved a continual scandal to many good Christians, and bred a continual division in the Church, and if restored, that the scandal will be ten times greater then ever, and the sufferings of innocent souls for non-conformity to them, an hundred times more then ever: are they yet lawful? or desirable? or is it worth the dying to maintain the Churches power as to the establishing such Ceremonies? The Father of old we know thought the best way to convert the heathens, was *to have nothing to do with their Rites, &c.* And is not this the likeliest way to convince the Romish

Queritis quomodo vincuntur Paganis deservit eorum ritus, &c.

Romish idolaters? at least to keep our souls clear of their guilt?

XIV. 'Tis true; The number of Ceremonies retained in our Church, pretending to any legal authority, is but small: The *Surplis*, the *Cross*, and *kneeling at Sacrament*, are (we think) all; but we know how grossly all these are abused by the Papists, that none of them have any footing in Scripture; that *kneeling at Sacrament* was never heard of in the Church till 1226. in Pope Honorius his time, admirably fitted to their idolatry of *Transubstantiation*. That they grossly make the *Cross* an Idol. That the *Surplis* is made significant of many things, for which we can see no ground at all; that all these have been strenuously opposed, by as holy and learned men as any our Church hath bred: That the pattern of all *Synods Acts* 15. thought fit to impose only some few necessary things for the state of the Church at that time. That the urging of these Ceremonies, hath been the cause of sad separations, the loss of diverse learned and holy mens ministry: The offence of the generality of pious people. That the employment of the *Ecclesiastical Courts*, was almost wholly taken up about Ministers and peoples not conforming to these, instead of admonishing, suspending, excommunicating, scandalous and debauched Ministers and people, &c.

XV. We know further, that though there be no more Ceremonies established by Law as yet, yet there are many probationers, such as *bowing at the Name of Jesus*, *bowing to the Altar*, *saying second Service*, (much like the Popish in *Secreto's*, which the people must not hear) and what not almost? And we can see no reason, but the Churches power, if allowed to appoint any (save only such without which the Service of God, would apparently to all rational men, be performed indecently & disorderly) may appoint hundreds.

XVI. Nor is it prudence (could such a power be allowed to State or Church) for either of them in such cases, to do all that they may in strictness be proved to have a power to do. Many men think that the State hath power in any civil things by Laws, to oblige the consciences of Subjects to do any things not forbidden in Gods Word: and doubtless the States power, in such kind of Laws, is far less disputable, then in the case of Ceremonies relating to the worship of God. Yet the wisdom of all States, restrains them from enjoining people by their Laws, to do such kind of things, for the doing of which, rational persons may not see a just reason of the Law, as either urging some Law of God, or tending to a

See more of this point about Ceremonies in *Altare Damascenum*. A dispute about the English Popish Ceremonies, Dr. Ames his fresh suit against Ceremonies, in all which this point about Ceremonies is excellently handled.

manifest publique, or private good. No State yet ever busied themselves, or tied their Subjects by making Laws, to command all their Subjects to wear Turbants, or a thousand such things, which would apparently signifie nothing of profit or advantage to the State, nor yet to particular persons, it were the way to bring their authority into contempt.

XVII. We would fain know, of what use, or profit, any of these Ceremonies are, we look upon them as things that *perish with the using*, and upon that account by no means reasonable (if otherwise lawful) for the grave Authority of a Church, or State to interpose in. And we hope God will thus far convince the Authority under which we are, that they will not for these husks of Ceremonies, destroy those many thousand Souls in England (who cannot conform to them) for whom yet Christ died. And we are most humbly thankful to His most-Excellent Majesty, for the indulgence, as to them, which he hath granted to us, through which, we can yet speak to our people that they may be saved: how long we shall enjoy this breathing time; the only all-knowing God can tell. We are sensible enough how much others envy it; we shall onely say (as Calvin once of Luther) *We wish they would use their heat against the known enemies of God* (such as are drunkards, blasphemers, unclean persons, cursers, swearers, &c.) *rather then against the servants of the living God*, who shall one day judge betwixt them and us; and who (as it is very probable) would more approve that zeal, then this fury.



A Postscript.

Containing a Threefold Supplement to the former Discourses.

The first, relating to the Chapter about the Antiquity of Liturgies. The Second, to the Argument about Idolatrous Usages. The Third, to the Argument concerning scandalizing of Brethren.

I. **T**Here is nothing in which those we have to deal with in these Points of *Liturgies, Ceremonies, Musick* in Churches, &c. will pretend more advantage against us, than in the business of *Antiquity*, nothing so much in their mouths, as *all Antiquity*, all the *Fathers*, the Church of God in *all ages*, hath been of their minds. Our Brethren know, or may know, that the Writings of the *Ancients*, for 8 or 900 years, viz. from Pope *Gregories* time, till the *Reformation*, were in hands, by no means to be trusted, and that the *Papists*, who (for the most part of the time) had them in their keeping, as they had opportunity, so they neglected not their time, to correct the *Fathers*, to put in, and leave out what they pleased, to suppress what of their Writings they pleased, and to publish *Canons of Councils*, and *Commentaries*, and other Writings under *Specious Names*, without any shadow of Truth, or any reasonable *Modesty*: So that it hath been a great piece of the work of our Reformed *Divines*, to look over the books with which the *Popish* writers in that time had filled the world, and prepared in M.S. for it (which M. Scripts they have since published in part, and what part yet remains who knows.) He is but meanly versed in Divinity that knows not, that *Bellarmino*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Possevinus* and *Erasmus* (four *Popish* writers) have took some pains of this nature, and how many hundred pieces of pretended Antiquity, not only *Protestant* writers, but even the *Papists* themselves have been forced to disclaim and reject. And how many more our learned *Cocus*, *Rivet*, *Perkins*, and others have shewed them as much reason to reject. Yet we cannot but observe,

Suppl. 1.

Witness the
Indices expurgatorii.

hoy

were to be found, that used the same words in prayer. That *Chapier* of *Socrates* is well worthy the reading over, by which some Divines of our times, may see that as there was then no such Uniformity of *Worship* and *Ceremonies* as is now contended for; so neither had *Socrates*, such a reverend opinion, of those that were so zealous to bring in *Ceremonies*, but looked upon it as a *Judaizing humour* in them, without any justifiable ground from the word of God. The Chapter is too long, and the passages too many to transcribe, the Reader may satisfy himself by perusal of it.

III. Having the advantage of this Supplement, we shall crave leave of our Readers to add some few things, to advantage our Argument against the *Common-prayer Books*, (ordinarily obtruded upon us,) from what we have said before; *That we find in them a mode of Worship and Forms, which hath been formerly used in idolatrous services*: upon which account we are much inclined to think it not lawful for us to use them in the service of God, especially considering what we have said before, (from the Apostle) *The Earth is the Lords, and the fulness thereof*. We may easily use other words. Suppl. 2.

WE would hope, that many of our Brethren, who are zealous for *Liturgies*, do believe, that the worship of the Church of *Rome*, is *Idolatrous*, and hath been so ever since the practice of praying to *Saints* and *Angels*; praying before *Images*; the worshipping of *Crosses* and *Relicks*, and the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* came up amongst them. If any be otherwise minded, we have nothing to do with them, but only to commend them to that learned Treatise of Dr. *Reinolds*, *De Idolatria Ecclesia Romana*; and the many Tracts, and pieces of tractates wrote by *Protestant Divines* to prove this charge.

IV. We remember what *Tertullian* saith, *Principale crimen generis humani, summus seculi reatus; tota causa judicii Idolatria*: *Tertull. l. de idol. cap. 1.* Of all sins, none so horrid as that of *Idolatriy*: This is sufficiently asserted in Scripture, and proved by *Tertullian* and others. *Tertul.* proves the idolater a *murderer*, an *adulterer* a thief, &c. And certainly if Christians be bound to abstain from all appearance of evil, they are much more obliged to take heed of any thing that hath the least appearance of *this evil*, or affinity to it.

V. That *Idolatriy* is not only committed, by worshipping the creature *terminatively* (which was an *idolatriy* we believe very few were ever guilty of,) but also, by the offering up any homage proper

Non est auditum à saeculis, quod quis arcam vocaret Deum suum, vel ollam, vel pixidem: Gul. Paris de leg. c. 26.

per and due unto God onely, before any creature, as the *medium*, or as representative of God, is so eminently proved by the instances of the Jews worshipping the golden Calf (who yet proclaimed the feast to *Jehovah*) which the Apostle calls *Idolatri* 1 Cor. 10. By *Jeroboams*, and *Michals* idolatry, and diverse others, that it is not a point now to be disputed, being granted by all *sober Protestants*. But besides these two wayes, there are others also by which we may be guilty of the sin of *Idolatri*, or a *Jews Idololatria*, as *Tertullian* speaks, accessory, if not principals. The Apostle 1 Cor. 10. plainly determines, that to eat of meat offered to idols (in the idols temple) was to have a fellowship with devils.

Lev. 19. 19.
27, 28.

Gul. Paris
ibid. cap. 12.

VI. Gods *Eminent hatred* of idolatry, was seen by diverse severe prohibitions to his people, forbidding any fellowship with idolaters, or imitation of their *actions*, or to follow their *modes*, and *methods* of worship; or to use such names as they used to call their idols by in their speaking to God. 1. For civil usages, Lev. 19. 19. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed; neither shall a garment of linnen and woollen come upon thee. V. 27. You shall not round the corners of your heads; neither shalt thou marr the corners of thy beard, 28. you shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you. To this head may also be referred the law against *womans wearing mans apparel*; or the *man wearing a womans apparel*. All these saith Gul. Paris were to avoid the imitation of *Idolaters*. The first (saith he) was *sugillatio cultura seu idolatria Veneris & Priapi*. The garment mingled of linnen and wooll was forbidden them (saith he) because the *Egyptian Priests* did use such, *Aquinas*, *Liranus*, *Tostatus*, *Hugo*, &c. give the same reason. *Herodotus* tells us, that the *Arabians* were wont to shave their hair, and to cut the corners of their beards, to bring their hair into a round figure. (which the Prophet *Jeremy* confirms, describing them under the notion of such as had the corners of their hair polled, Jer. 9. 26. and again 49. 32. (see the *Margent* in our *English Bibles*.) The *Syrians*, *Egyptians*, and *Arabians*, were wont to pull off their hairs to make baldnes betwixt their eyes, to make prints and marks in their flesh, in mourning for the dead; God forbids them to his people, Deut. 14. 1. Lev. 19. 28. The *Hebr. Doctors* give this reason for this command, as may be seen in their 61. Neg. prec. as also 62. 63. *Lucian*, *Plutarch*, *Kirchmannus*, *Arnobius*, *Ensebins*, *Cicero*, *Pliny*, with many more, tell us strange

strange stories of the heathens usages of this nature. All which God forbid his people, (as *Gul. Parisiensis* well notes) to root out all the mention of idolatry from amongst them, and to restrain them from any manner of conformity to the manners of idolaters. Upon which account also *matrimonial marriages* were expressly forbidden betwixt the Jews and any idolatrous Nations.

2. In a further detestation of this sin, and for a further caution, God says *Hos. 2. 16, 17. Thou shalt call me no more Baali, thou shalt call me Ishi; for I will take away the names of Baalim out of thy mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by that name.* Where we note, that God would not allow (especially in his worship) that his people should use a Name to him, (how good, and proper soever) which had been used in an idolatrous service. *Tarnovius* and *Rivet* both observe that the name *Baali* was not onely proper enough, (signifying *My Lord*) but also had formerly had a sacred use; God himself using it of himself, *Is. 54. 5.* but it having been afterwards defiled by an *Emphatical* use, in an *Idolatrous service*; God abhors it, and will no more be called by it. This sense *St. Hierom* of old gave of the Text; and *Ballester* the Jesuite in his *Onomatographia* agrees in it. *Lyranus* indeed follows *R. Solomon Jarchi* in another interpretation, making *Baali* *Nomen timoni, Ishi Nomen amoni.*

But as (amongst the *Heb. Doctors, Kimchi* and *Aben Ezra* interpret it more rightly, viz. That the reason why *Baali* was forbidden, was, because it was the Name of an *Idol*; so the *Caldee Paraphrast* agrees in that sense; and *Ribera* (though a Jesuit) is full in it, and concludeth, that *Bahal* and *Ishi* signifie the same thing, *ὁ ἀνδρῶν* (whence possibly that phrase in *John 3. He that hath the Bride, is the Bridegroom*) and that the sense of the Text, is this, *Seeing the Word Ishi and Baali signifie the same thing, yet I so hate the Names of Idols, that I will not have that spoken which might be well spoken, in regard of the ambiguity and similitude of the word.* *Ribera* makes *St. Hierom* his Author, with whom also *Cocceius* agrees in these terms,

— Ne dum aliud loquitur, alterius recordatur.

least men speaking to God, should think of Idols. In this sense also agrees *Cyriel Alexandrinus* (or whoever he was who is the Author of those Commentaries, which go under his Name, upon

Note, that both in 2 Hos. 15. 16. and in Zech. 13. 2. two texts plainly relating to the times of the Gospel, God forbids all mention of Idolatry, and declares his will that it should not be so much as remembered. Now we cannot see how we should obey those precepts, in keeping their very Rites, Modes, and Methods, of worship. V. Cald paraph. in 2 Hos.

Ribera in 2 Hos. 16.

the

the *Small Prophets*, Printed, Gr. Lat. *Ingolstadtii*, 1607.) To this agrees the Learned *Rivet*, *Zanchy*, *Daneus*, *Sanctius*, *Polanus*, in short, almost all creditable Authors. Let us only add some of *Zanchies* and *Rivets* Notes, upon the Text, not impertinent to our purpose.

*Zanchius in
Hof.*

“God declares here (saith *Zanchy*) that the *Israelites* (having put
“all superstitions out of their Temples, yea out of their mouths
“and minds) should be content with one God alone, and with
“his pure Word. And accordingly he teacheth us, that a true
“Reformation is not in those places, nor a true Worship or Re-
“ligion there, where *ANY* Reliques of false Religion do re-
“main: For all the Footsteps of Superstition must be taken a-
“way, not only out of Churches, but out of our mouths and
“memories, that no door may be left open to former Idolatry:
“For the very remembrance of *False Worship*, hath an influence upon
“men, to incite them to it again. We must therefore let no-
“thing of the *Papish Worship* remain, unless we would have it all in
“again.

*Rivetus in
Hof.*

The Learned *Rivet* in his *Corollaries from this Scripture*, makes
this for one; “That there are many Names which in themselves
“are good enough, and might be used, but God abhorreth the
“use of them, because they have been abused to Idolatry. He in-
“stanceth in the word *Mass*, applied to the Sacrament of the Lords
Supper, (to which may be added *Priest* and *Altar*) Then he in-
ferreth thus.

Ibid.

“Hence we may judge, how prudently some of the *Ancients*
“did to use the names of *Old Superstition*, in opening the *Sacred*
“*Services* of Christians: whence arose another superstition, and
“the purity of *Divine worship* was vitiated. And there is reason to
“fear, least the same thing should happen in those Churches, in
“which (though they pretend a Reformation) yet the very words,
“*Ceremonies* and *Rites* of the Papists are preserved. — That
“the restauration of *Divine worship* may please God, and be
“proved to come from him as the author of it, it must be perfect.
“Let no reliques of that worship, which God rejecteth remain.
“Let them therefore who yet keep Images in their Churches, and
“defend them, and other Reliques of false Religion, consider,
“whether they can say, that the names of *Baalim* are taken away
“amongst them: but enough is spoken to prove our second ob-
“servations.

3. But thirdly, God more expressly forbade his people, *any usages in his worship, which were used in idolatrous services.* To this purpose was that Precept, *Exod. 20. 26.* and that *v. 24.* in which God forbade the people of Israel, to go up by steps unto his altar; or to make an altar of hewen Stone. Both (as *Lyranus, Lippomannus,* and many others agree,) *That they might not be like idolaters;* Those filthy beasts that worshipped *Priapus*, were wont so to ascend by steps. And the heathens much fancied an *August Pompos* serving of their gods, and therefore made their *Altars* of hewen stone. God would have his *Altar* of Earth, or rough stones, to let them see he regarded not that pompous splendor, but abominated these things which were borrowed from Idolaters. We do not understand why it is reckoned as the sin of those, *Ezech. 8. 16.* that they worshipped with their faces towards the East, (which was unlawful to the Israelites) save onely that the Heathens so worshipped their idols; (which perhaps was the reason why the temple stood another way) we are sure *Aquinas* assigns this as a reason, why (as he saith) the Jews worshipped Westward. The same was the reason against *Groves near Gods Altar, Dent. 16. 22.* Such had the Heathens *Ex. 34. 13.* It was laid to the Israelites charge, *2 Chron. 13. 9.* that they made priests like the Nations: and it was *Ahaz* his great sin, *2 Chron. 16. 11.* that he must have his Altar like that of *Damascus*. There are that think, that it was a piece of *Uzzab's* guilt, (for which God smote him with death,) that he carried the Ark upon a new Cart, (as the Idolatrous *Philistines* had done before) we are not ignorant that he failed in other points of order too. But we shall shut up this with two remarkable Texts, the one *Levit. 18. 3.* After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein you dwelt, shall you not do, and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, you shall not do, neither shall you walk in their Ordinances; you shall do my judgements, and keep my Ordinances, and walk in them, I am the Lord your God, you shall therefore keep my Statutes, and my judgements, which if a man do, he shall live in them.

The second Text (yet more remarkable) is that *Dent. 12. 29, 30. &c.* When the Lord thy God shall cut off the Nations from before thee, whither thou goest to possess them; and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their land, take heed to thy self, that thou be not snared, by following them, after that they be destroyed before thee, and that thou enquire not after their Gods, saying, How did these nations serve their Gods.

Gods. Even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the Lord thy God. — What thing soever I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it. Upon the first Text the learned Dr. Willet (who surely was no Fanatique, no not in the Irish dialect, but though he had not the honour to be a Father, may pass for a Son of the Church) observes, That by the two Nations Egypt and Canaan, all other Nations were understood, whose corrupt manners they were to decline, Jer. 10. 2. By the latter Text certainly in general, all humane inventions in the worship of God, are forbidden, and more particularly, the imitation of Idolaters in their Modes, and Methods of worship. Considering the force of all which Texts, our hair almost stands right up, to read a late Prelates book (if it be his) about Ceremonies, where with a variety of Learning he shews our Ceremonies, are borrowed partly from the Idolatrous heathen, partly from the Idolatrous Papists, and yet he justifies the use of them, yea could almost justify the reduction of a great part of the Ceremonial Law of the Jews, so long since abolished.

Bish. Andrews.

VII. We are the more startled at it to consider the zeal of the Ancients, (whom when our brethren please, or rather when they are pleased by what they find in them, they use so much to adore) in this great and momentous case. Tertullian in his admirable Book, *de Idololatriâ*, chargeth very many Symbolizing with Idolaters, it will not be amiss to give the Reader his heads.

Tertull. de Idololat. lib.

1. Such as made Statues and Images, (though it were their trade) he tells these poor trades-men, That they sacrificed their wit, their sweat, their labour, their art, to the Idol. *Illis ingenium tuum immolas, illis sudorem tuum libas, illis prudentiam tuam accendis, plus es illis quam sacerdos, quam per te habeant sacerdotem.* He brings under this guilt, all kind of Mechanicks employed about building, or adorning Idol-temples, &c. or the making up, or adorning the Idols.

Cap. 6.

Cap. 9.

2. His second sort are Astrologers, whom he proves deeply guilty.

Cap. 10. A

3. His third sort are School-masters, he says these are *affines multimoda Idololatriæ*, a kin to Idolatry, in naming the names of Idols, and making honourable mention of them in their Orations, &c. Polanus on 2 Hof. also toucheth this as not favouring enough of Christianity. Tertullian saith, *Hinc prima diabolo fides edificatur ab initiis eruditionis.*

4. A fourth sort he instanceth in, are those that keep Holy-
 dayes dedicated to Idolatrous service, where he complains of the
 Christians in his time that kept *Saturnalia*, *Jannarias*, *Brumas*,
Matronales, the Pagan Holy-dayes, (in stead of *Saturnalia*, is
 our Christmas at the very same time of the year) here he cries
 out, *O melior fides Nationum in suam sectam!* The Heathens
 (saith he) will nor keep our *Sabbath-day*, nor our *Pentecost*, but
 we must keep their Festivals. How much more true to their Reli-
 gion are they, then we to ours?

In the next place he brings them under the guilt of *Symbolizing* Cap. 5.
 with *Idolaters*, who adorned their gates, and posts, and houses,
 after the Pagan manner at Festivals, (as we do at *Christmas*) with
Lamstel, *Ivy*, &c. One would think this were an innocent usage,
 yet how vehemently doth that good man inveigh against it? *Ac-*
cendat igitur quotidie lucernas quibus lux nulla est, adfigant postibus
lauros postea arsuras quibus ignes immanent, & testimonia tenebrarum
& auspicia poenarum. Tu, lumen es mundi, & arbor viceris semper.
Si templum renunciaſti ne facias templum januam tuam. Minus
dixi, si lupanaribus renunciaſti, ne indueris faciem domi tue, novum
lupanaris.

We need proceed no further, what would this good man have
 said to our *Candlemas services*, to our *Christmas Ives* and *Bays*,
 &c. nay to an hundred things of higher consequence then these
 are? Nor do we find this primitive zeal against appearances of *Ido-*
lary, in single persons onely, but also in Councils. v. *Concil.*
Antistrod. can. 1. *Concil. Tolet.* 4. can. 10. with diverse other *Ca-*
*non*s made against the *Calends of January*, (which with us is turned
 to *New-years-day*) *Concil. Tolet.* would not suffer *Allelujah* be sang
 that day, because it was a Pagan Holy-day. Other Councils for the
 same reason forbad *Green-boughs*, and *Laurels* in adorning houses.
St. Austin forbad Christians to fast on the *Lords day*, because the
Manichees did so. *Ep. 86. Gul. Parisensis* saith, the Church L. de leg.
 would not allow fasting on *Fridays*, because the *Turks* use it. In
 short *Aquinas*, *Suarez*, *Bellarmino*, *Parisensis*, are all zealous, for
 avoiding all usages of idolaters, which were not necessary. *Aug-*
ustine de verbis Domini Ser. 6. calls to Christians to leave all the
 rites, all the solemnities of the Pagans, and thinks this the best
 way to convert them. And why should such care be used as to
 Heathens, but because their services were *Idolatrous*, they *Ido-*
laters? We are at loss to know wherein they were greater *Idola-*
ters

ters then the *Papists*. *Parisiensis* saith right, none of the learned of them were ever so mad as to worship a piece of wood; yet the *Papists* worship a piece of bread. The *Rabbies* of the Heathen were doubtless (as we said before) of *Plato's* mind, that God was (they knew not well what) the *Soul of the World*; or of the same mind that *Trismegistus*, one of their great Philosophers was, that there were certain Spirits, which they called Gods, which came and took possession of those Statues, when they had made them; and they onely made their Statues for thrones (as it were) for their Gods, and supposed representations, or some things to put them in mind of God.

VIII. Now considering this we hope (how uncharitably soever the Bishop of Exeter judgeth of us in our obtaining from the use of the *Common-prayer Book* ordinarily sold) God will judge otherwise, and so will the generality of sober Christians. Let his Lordship speak out, *Is the Church of Rome Idolatrous yea or no? Is her worship so in the whole complex yea or not?* If he sayes no, he flies in the face of all Protestant writers. If he sayes it is, we proceed further with him. *Is that mode or method of worship prescribed in the books of Common-prayer, ordinarily to be sold, (as to the far greater part) the same, which was formerly used, and is to this day used (though in another Language) by those Idolaters?* If he says no, let any one diligently compare the *Collects, Lerany, &c.* with the four books before mentioned, and judge whether he speaks truth or no: If he says it is, we ask him again, *Is that Service Book necessary to the worship of God, either by a Divine Law, or by any necessity of nature?* If he saith that it is, he will need none to confute him: If he saith it is not, only as commanded by the Church, or by the *Laws of the Land*; we desire to know of him, whether the use of such things as are not necessary, ought to be retained, when they have been once abused to Idolatry? If it were clear to us, that the *Laws of the Land* did command the use of the *Service-book* (ordinarily sold) under a penalty, we should take our selves bound with patience to suffer the penalty, but (considering the premises) we could never do the thing. But that doth not yet appear to us, how soon it may, we know not, *The will of the Lord be done.* Onely because our Adversaries have such a delight to whisper us into suspicions of disaffection, and disloyalty, moroseness, perverseness, peevishness, faction; let us from the premises argue with them a little for our selves.

IX. Can you think it lawful to use modes of worship (abused to
Idola-

Idolatrous services) when God would not allow his ancient people, a *civil usage*, which was peculiar to the idolatrous nations? was it unlawful for them, because the *Egyptian Priests wore garments mixed of linnen and woollen*, to put any such on their backs? And is it lawful for us to put on *Vestments* (onely to be used in the worship of God) which are confessed to have been after the manner both of the *Pagan and Romish Idolaters*? Might not they suffer their *cattel to gender with diverse kinds*, nor sow their grounds with diverse sorts of seed, because the heathen did it? and may we in our worship of God, serve him with diverse sorts of *Ceremonies*, and *modes and methods of worship*, some borrowed from *Pagans*, some from *Papists*? (as Bishop Andrews confesseth and proves) though some others of a more innocent extract be mingled with them? Might not they round their beards, because the *Arabians* did so (who were Idolaters) nor make *prins and marks in their flesh*? because the Heathens did so. And may we, in the worship of God, use those very *postures, figures, forms, actions*, which Gods word no where requires, nor are practised in any other Church, but in a *Synagogue of Idolaters*? Would not God suffer his people to cill him *Baali*, (though the name be of an honest and proper signification, and such a name as himself sometimes called himself by) when once it was abused to Idolatry, but must the people after that cill him *Ishi* not *Baali*? And can we *speak unto God in prayer*, in the same *forms of words, phrases, &c.* which *Idolaters* have profaned, and judge our selves innocent? Might not the Jews go up by *steps to Gods Altar*, because the *Heathen* did so? Nor make God an *Altar of Stone*, but of *Earth*, because the Idolatrous Heathen, went up by *steps to the Altars of their Gods*, and made their *Idols Pompous Altars*. And may we do those things while they are done by *Idolatrous Papists*? Was it a guilt in *Ahaz*, that he would have an *Altar* like that of *Damascus*; and shall it be no guilt to us, that we must have a *mode of worship*, as near that of an *Idolatrous Synagogue*, as may be? Were the Jews commanded not so much as to enquire how the *Idolatrous Heathens worshipped their Gods*: or to say, *we will go and do likewise*. Nay were they strictly forbidden to do it, and as to the worship of God commanded to keep strictly to the command of God, not adding thereto, not diminishing therefrom; and shall it be our practice to say, *we will go and do just what the Papists do*, and come as near to them as we can? such workings as these we find in our hearts.

See Bishop Andrews on Ceremonies, p. 52.

X. When

X. When we hear some telling of us, these were *Ceremonial* and *Judicial Laws* not obliging us *Christians*. Others, That it is true, we ought not to chuse these things, but being commanded we ought to do and use them. And others again, That although the *Papish Idolaters*, do or did use these forms, and rites, yet these things were not *Idolatrous*, nor were the *Papists* the first that used them, for they were used by the *purser Church*, (they know not when nor where) And others, That we must not reject all words, phrases, rites, and actions, which idolaters have used, spake or done, and would with these things relieve our selves.

XI. We find our consciences thus *ex tempore* replying, Are then the Laws of God restraining conformity vith Idolaters *Ceremonial*? what vvas there in them *typical*, or *carnal*? The *typical* services, and *carnal ordinances* of the *Ceremonial Law*, are abolished; but do these commands relate to them? There were also diverse particular *Judicial Laws*, which the wisdom of God thought fit for the *Jewish polity*, which in *particulari* do oblige no other. But doth not the equity of the *Judicial Law* oblige? was not the end of these Laws to bear witness against idolatry; and that Gods people by no communion with Idolaters, by no *apish imitation* of them, should defile themselves, or provoke him, or grow again in love with them? Doth not God hate *Idolatry* now as much as then? is his jealousy abated? or hath he since parted with his glory to graven Images? What means the Apostle then *1 Cor. 10.* in cautioning the *Corinthians* to flee from *Idolatry*, and to take heed of eating of the *Love-feast* in the *Idols Temple*? Are they not *Gospel-times* which God speaks of *Hos. 2. 16.* when his people should not call him *Baali* but *Ishi*? nor remember the names of Idols? and which he speaks of *Zech. 13. 3.*

XII. If we would relieve our selves by the command of *Magistrates interposing*; besides that vve can find no such thing, (and pray that we never may) Our consciences tell us, that if after these Laws *Moses* had commanded the *Israelites* to make round their beards, or to wear garments of *linnen* or *woollen*, or women to wear mens apparel, &c. His command could not have justified the *Israelites* practice. We freely allow *Magistrates*, all just Authority, but not to command people to do what the Lord hath forbidden them.

XIII. VVhen vve are told, that though *Idolaters* used these Rites, Modes, &c. yet these Rites and Forms vvere not *Idolatrous*, and that

that we hear they were used by Christians, before there was any Popish Idolatry in the world, and that we must not throw away all things, and abominate all Actions, Rites, Ceremonies, vvhich Idolaters have abused. Our consciences presently tell us, That there was no Idolatry in the cutting of a beard, nor in sowing ground vvhith mingled seed, nor in an Altar of hewen stone, nor in a linssey-woolsey garment; nor in the name Baali, nor in the Corinthians meat.

2. That though some have talked that these Rites and Modes were used before any Popery vvas in the vworld, yet none have proved it, or if they were, yet they are not commanded by God, and might be borrowed from the Pagan Idolaters, (as Bishop Andrews proves they vvere) That the name Baali vvas used lawfully, and yet might not be used, vvhhen it had been abused in idolatrous service.

3. Our consciences further say, That things of necessary use, (vvwhether the necessity arose from Nature, or from a Divine Law) ought to be retained, though abused to Idolatry. (the question is not about them) They onely tell us, that it is sin to us to use Modes, Forms, Methods of Divine Worship, which Idolaters have used, there being no such necessity of them, either from Nature, or any divine precept; and such Rites, Gestures, Ceremonies, as are not commanded from the Law of Nature, nor from any Divine Laws, but have been used by Idolaters, and distinguished their superstitious worshippings of God, from the worship of the true Churches of Christ.

XIV. In fine. VVe dread the sin of Idolatry; it is the principale peccatum Generis humani (saith Tertullian) vve dread any kind of conformity (not necessary) to Idolaters: * VVe believe the Papists such. And vve cannot but judge, that if vve should in our vvorshipping of God conform to their Modes, and Forms, and Rites, vve should be more guilty of sin, then those Mechanics, that make Statues, Images, Crucifixes, Agnus Dei, for them; (all vvhom yet Tertullian vvould have concluded guilty.) And vve cannot but admire, that any who pretend to reverence the Fathers, to take their dictates, should think light of this Argument: vvhat vvould Tertullian have said to this? who vvould not endure Bayes and Ioy at Christians gates; and vvho determineth all arts, professions, trades, which are exercised, in making any Statues, Images, Idols, or any things for their use and service to be (upon this ac-

* In any distinctive usages, or in modes of worship.

account) defiled. VVe judge not others in this thing, let not them judge us; vve shall conclude this with that forementioned passage of Tertullian.— *O melior fides Nationum in sectam suam! qua nullam solemnitatem Christiani sibi vendicat, non Dominicum diem, non Pentecosten; etiam si nosset nobiscum non communicassent, timerent enim, ne Christiani viderentur. Nos ne Ethnici pronunciemur non veremur.* Let the Reader for *Nationum* and *Ethnici*, put in *Pontificiorum* and *Pontificii*, and for *Christiani*, *Protestantes*, and see vvhath sense it vwill make; vve are assured, the Papists vwould be more true to their Religion, then to borrow from us *Rites, Vestments, Modes, or Forms of Worship*, or any thing of that Nature. But enough is said up on this theme.

Suppl. 3.

VVe remember, that in plea for our selves, as to our forbearance of using the *Common-prayer Books*, vve urged the scandal, which we are assured, that our using of it would give to tender conscientious Christians. VVe are not ignorant how much this plea is derided by some, and therefore shall take a little further liberty here to make it good:

1. VVe cannot without some trembling weigh those many Scriptures, by which God hath secured both the *lives* and *souls* of our brethren from our injuries. Upon this account it vvas that the Israelites vvere not to build an house without battlements, *Deut. 22.* Nor to leave a pit uncovered, *Exod. 21. 33.* Nor to put a stumbling stone before the blind, *Levit. 19. 14.* And as in reason the soul is more precious then the body, so the vwise God hath proportionably forbidden us to do any things (in their own nature indifferent) by vvhich the souls of our brethren may be endangered by sinning against God. This is the main business of a Christian; of more value by far, then the asserting of his own liberty, *Rom. 14. 13.* He must judge this rather that no man lay a stumbling block, or offence before his brother. No man must seek his own, but the good of others, *1 Cor. 10. 24.* VVe must give no offence, &c. *ibid.* Our liberty must not be used to the scandal of the weak, *1 Cor. 8. 9.* If our brother be offended, or grieved with our meat, we do not walk charitably, we must not destroy him with our meat, for whom Christ died, *Rom. 14. 15.* We must not for our meat destroy the work of God. *v. 20.* It is a good thing, neither to eat flesh, nor to do any thing at which our brother should stumble, or be offended, or made weak. Saint Paul *1 Cor. 8. 13.* resolved never to eat flesh while he lived, rather then to offend his weak brother.

2. VVe

2. We are not ignorant what is said to take off the edge of this Argument; we are told first, That these precepts *only* concern us, where the command of our Superiors, doth not make the thing necessary. 2. That diverse are scandalized, because of our not conforming. 3. That all our liberty will be taken away, if we hearken to our peoples humours; there being nothing we can wear or do, at which some or other will not take offence.

3. But we would (as to the first thing) gladly know, whether those precepts of the Apostle, be not reducible to the Moral Law? and whether the Magistrate be not as much obliged not to command things indifferent, where such a scandal will arise, as the inferior not to do them? We suppose that our Brethren will not say, that the Magistrates command, can justify any soul in violating the express Law of God. And as they themselves would not interpret the Law of God thus, *Thou shalt not steal*, i. e. except thy Superior command thee; or, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, i. e. unless thou be so commanded: so they must pardon us if we cannot so interpret the Law of God in the case of Scandal. We humbly conceive that the Magistrate himself is by the Law of God restrained from commanding any thing by which weak Christians may be stumbled, offended, or made weak.

4. The true notion of a scandalous action, (in the sense we are now speaking to it) is, Any action done by us (not being required by the divine Law) by which our brother, (whether from the nature and condition of the thing done, or the intention of him that doth it, or both) is made to sin against God: It is true, there are a generation of men whom the doing of our duty will make to blaspheme; but our duty doth not *ex conditione operis*, lay any such stumbling block before them. This is what Aquinas calls *Scandalum Phariseorum*, which our Saviour hath taught us to condemn. But to make a true Scandal, that which we do must be of that nature, as may give a cause of stumbling to our brethren; and this cannot be otherwise then in our ill use of our liberty, as to things of their own nature indifferent, but not appearing so unto all. For if the thing done by us, appear to our brethren a thing indifferent, there can be no Scandal. It is but a reachy humour in any to be offended at us, for any thing which they grant we may lawfully do; nor can they by our practice in such things be possibly made to sin *ex conditione operis*. But where a thing appears to us in its own nature indifferent to be done, or not to be done, and doth not appear so to other

conscientious Christians, (which was the case amongst the Christians at Rome and Corinth) here we conceive our selves obliged to restrain our own liberty out of charity to our Brethrens souls. And as we conceive it our duty in practice to do so, so we conceive it the duty of Superiours to restrain their (supposed) liberty in commanding; the reason is because the liberty of a Magistrate, or a private Christian, is of far less value, then a soul for which Christ died.

5. Now our Brethren may be made to sin by our practice in such things, many ways, 1. *When our action causeth them to vilifie, censure, and condemn us*, and to withdraw themselves from communion with us. 2. *When our example draws on them to do the like, while their conscience is not satisfied*, which is the very case mentioned, 1 Cor. 8. 10. 'Tis their sin to do it, (not fully perswaded in their own mind) 'tis our sin by our example to intice them to it. Take heed least by any means that liberty of yours, becomes a stumbling block to them that are weak; for if any man see thee, who hast knowledge, sit at meat, in the Idols temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak, be emboldned to eat those things which are offered to Idols? This is plainly our case. Supposing that we were fully satisfied, that it were lawful for us to use an imposed form, and that it were no restraining in us the gifts of the holy Spirit, no prejudice to our intencion of mind, nor to the fervency of our affection, nor to the affections of such as hear us, nor any yielding of that liberty, (as to the worshipping of God) with which Christ hath made us free, nor any addition to the rule of worship, which God hath set us in his Word, and that (notwithstanding it be confessed that these or those Modes, Forms and Methods, have been used by Idolaters) yet we may lawfully enough use them: yet we plainly see that they are so abhorred of many conscientious Christians, that as those who have returned to the use of them, have almost ruined their ministry, by making themselves the scorn of some, and the grief of others; so should we do the like, some would for it vilifie and censure us, and condemn us, and separate from communion with us. Now suppose this would be their sin, yet the thing being (suppose) in its own nature indifferent, we have learned out of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 8. 12. *That when we sin against our brethren, and wound their weak consciences, we sin against Christ*. And far be it from us to gratifie men by sinning against Christ.

6. Again, whereas the Bishop of Exeter supposeth, *That our example*

example would do much to bring over our people, to hear, &c. We do ingenuously profess, that we believe it would prevail with some, who would at the present, seeing us (vwho they think have knowledge) use those Modes of Worship, (though with some reluctance) be emboldned in their consciences, to come and hear; ('tis no more then the Apostle supposeth 1 Cor. 8. 10.) but as they in doing of it should sin, so we by setting them an example, should directly act against the Apostles precepts, and lay stumbling blocks before them; and when they have done it, the tempter may Triumph over them, and we be found too weak to relieve their consciences, telling them, *That to follow us they have sinned against their light,* and the rebukes of their own consciences.

7. Besides, though it be apparent that those Scriptures which mention the precepts against scandal, take notice of *weak brethren only*, such for whom Christ died, such in whom is *some work of God*, which we must not destroy. And indeed in reason, these are chiefly to be considered. For the end of the precept is to save the hazard of the soul of our Brethren, by sin; now there are a generation in the world, whose constant course is a course of presumptuous sinning, they drink, they swear, they curse, they blaspheme, they wallow in beastly lusts, they will not be stopt in a full carreare for hell, (whose offence vve are not so concerned to regard) yet even to the worst of men, vve conceive our selves so far obliged by the Law of Charity, as not vvillfully, by our example to *harden them in sin*, and make them *justify themselves*. VVe are fully convinced, that there is nothing of more tendency to confirm the Papists in their way of vvorship, (which vve believe Idolatrous) then for them to see us keep much the same; nor are we alone in this opinion, Tertullian of old, and after him Augustine, were both of the same mind: Tertullian forbids Christians any of the Pagan usages, or coming nigh to any of their devotions, that if they would not be ashamed of their superstitions, they might yet be ashamed of the thin company that attended them. Augustine cryes out, *Quaritis quomodo vincantur Pagani; deserite eorum ritus*. VVe know how much some Papist-foreigners have triumphed, listening at the doors of some places vvhether they have heard Service, read and sung, crying out, *this is the same with theirs*. And not to insist upon the Papists only, vve have many (called Protestants) whom we believe most grievously to sin in their use of our Common-prayer, (be it never so lawful in it self) they believe, that their very repeating over

1 Cor. 8. 11. 18.
Rom. 14. 20. &
v. 15.

the

V. Dr. Spar-
rows Rationale.
p. 10.

Ibid. p. 8. 9.

the words of those prayers (because as they fancy) made by the Church, is devotion enough; they are taught so, that 'tis no matter for the *Vice*, or *Virtue* of the persons praying, the prayers are the prayers of the Church, and are acceptable to God; yea 'tis no matter whether they be *asleep*, or *awake*, *present* or *absent*, (if they have any just cause) nay more then this, they believe no prayers but these of any value, but *abomination to God*; they are taught so also. The publique worship of God prescribed by those to whom he hath given commission (the author should have done well to have told us who they are, and to have proved it) is the *only true and right publique worship*, and all other forms, and methods offered up, instead of that though never so exactly drawn, (and put up with never so much faith and fervency too, he should have said) are *strange worship*, because not commanded. Now away with all such *Atheistical doctrine*! according to which all prayer before and after Sermons is *strange worship*; the *fervent effectual prayer of the righteous*, (which Salomon saith) is *Gods delight*; and St. James saith, *availeth much*, is *strange worship*? Is not this strange Doctrine? yet verily we find many people of this faith, for which is not a tittle of Scripture, or *sound reason*; and is it not time that this *Brasen Serpent* should be a *Nehushtan*? should we that are Ministers of Christ, do any thing to please men, to countenance such gross conceits, such odious and abominable opinions in the hearts of people?

8. Whereas we are told that we offend many others, yea and those our *Superiors too*, because we do not do it. We answer we are not willing to offend any, much less our *Superiours*; but if we be brought to this strait, that we must either offend God or Men; the choice is not difficult. We do humbly conceive, that by *enticing*, or by our example *encouraging* others to sin, or by *hardening* any in sinful opinions, or courses, we should highly offend God; we are told so by his word: God knows our hearts, it is a *grievous Election* to us, when we are by the Law of God forced to chuse that part in practice, which shall offend our *Prince*, or any *Magistrates*, but our Souls are dear unto us; and in preserving our own and others Souls, we hope our Gracious Sovereign will not be offended.

9. However we wonder that our Brethren, who sometimes profess to so high an honour of St. *Augustine*, do not discharge us upon his credit; for we find him thus speaking:

Sed timeo inquires, ne offendam Majorem, time propterea, ne offendam majorem,

maorem, & non offendes Deum. Quid enim times ne offendas majorem? Aug. de Verbis vide ne forsan major sit isto quem times offendere? Majorem certe noli Dom. Scr. 6. offendere. — Quis est inquit major eo qui me genuit? An ille qui te ipsum creavit? — Ille qui te vidit ut faceret antequam esset, quem fecit, certe major est pater tuus. — And again, Qui enim resistit potestati Dei ordinationi resistit, sed quid si illud jubeat quod non debeas facere? — Timendo potestatem ipsos humanarum rerum gradus advertite. Si aliquid jusserit Curator nonne faciendum est? tametsi contra Proconsul jubeat, at non utiq; contemnis potestatem sed eligis majori servire, nec hinc debet minor irasci, si major prelatæ est. Rursum si aliquid ipse proconsul jubeat, & aliud jubeat Imperator, numquid dubitatur, in illo contemptu illi esse serviendum? Ergo si aliud Imperator, & aliud Deus, quid judicavis? Solve tributum: esto mihi in obsequio, Recte! sed non in idolio. In idolio prohibet? Quis prohibet? Major potestas Da Veniam. Tu Carcerem, ille Gehennam minatur. We presume our Brethren will grant this; but they will tell us, it is not *sinful* to use the *Liturgie*. That is the question, nor do we absolutely assert it; we only say, we so apprehend it, we have given our reasons. And while we thus judge, we humbly conceive our *forbearance* is our duty. For suppose our consciences mistaken, yet our Brethren will grant that even an erroneous conscience, will, and ought to tie our hands, and oblige us *ad non faciendum contra*, (nor is this an error in matter of faith, if it be an error) we are not stubborn against conviction, our eares are open, we desire satisfaction; and certainly it is not for nothing that we are content, by such refusal, to put our selves out of hopes of preferment, and into the number of *sheep marked out for the slaughter*, if a *Gracious Sovereign*, and an *Honourable Parliament*, doth not look with a more favourable aspect towards us, than some others do. But the will of the Lord be done. — Hic assumenda est fides nostra, tanquam Scutum. (saith Augustine) loc. præd.

10. Again offending is taken in a double sense, we are said to offend others, when we onely *displease them*, and *make them angry*. 2. When we lay a *stumbling block* before them, and *make them sin*. We acknowledge it our duty to avoid the first, (if it may be) as to our meanest Brethren, much more to our Superiors. But if the case be stated thus, here is a thing required to be done; if you do not do it, the *Magistrate* will be *offended through anger*; if you do it, many private Christians will be either *hardened in sin*, or, *tempted*.

to *sin* by your example. VVhat have we to do in this case? but to beg of our Superiours to be *merciful to us*; if in this thing we cannot hearken to them, being ready in all lawful things to yield them utmost *active obedience*, and here also a quiet *passive obedience*. And that this is our case is evident to all that will not stop their ears, and shut their eyes.

11. It is true we do hear some whispering, that by this we lay also a *stumbling block before our Fathers* the *Civil Magistrates*, and the *Bishops*, yea and many of our *Brethren*, who by our not using the said *Modes, and Forms of Worship*, are ready to judge us *disloyal, disobedient to Authority*, and we tempt them to draw out the *civil sword against us*, &c. Now if indeed we do acknowledge *Magistracy*, and are (as we profess) ready to yield obedience, those who otherwise judge of us, *sin against God*; and those who shall punish us as *disloyal* (we being not so) also *sin against God*. But by this *non-conformity*, they tell us, we gave Superiors just cause so to censure us, and so to deal with us.

12. But to this objection the answer is not difficult, for we suppose that all sober Divines are agreed in this principle, *Si de veritate scandalum sumatur, nilius nasci permittetur scandalum, quam quod veritas relinquatur*; it was an old determination, no man ought to commit any thing against the precepts of God, for fear of making others sin if he doth not commit it. Charity in this case certainly begins at home, we must not by *sin* destroy our own souls, out of charity, to prevent the destruction of the *work of God* in the souls of others. *Proximus ipse sibi*. It is a good thing for us to keep our souls from sin, and *good things scandalize none but evil hearts*, (saith *Tertullian*) Nor must our Brethren be scandalized, because we will not gratifie them with the use of our liberty, as well as others, whom they judge inferiour to them in *knowledge, wisdom, worldly station*, &c. we can appeal to God that our hearts are sincerely troubled, when vve hear of any *single person* in our Parishes scandalized, for our *omissions* in the case, provided they be such as are guilty of no profaneness in their lives, (the offence of open *profane and debauched drunkards, swearers, cursers, blasphemers, unclean persons*, doth not so much trouble us) and we dare not say but that there are some such, (though they be not the fortieth part of those that are zealous against us in this case) But what shall we, what can we do in the case for these good and sober Brethren?

Bona res neminem scandalizant nisi malam mentem.
Tert. de vel.
Vig. c. 3.

13. Whiles we judge the thing in it self not lawful, we cannot do it let who will be offended, and that will be granted by all; and vve have found some of our Brethren, who wish vve would do it, yet so ingenuous, as to beseech us, not for their sakes to wound our consciences. But suppose we did think it in it self and in all circumstances indifferent, that we might, or might not do it, we profess we should still be at a loss as the case stands, for these of our Brethren (whom we love and honour) how to gratifie them. We (suppose it) think the thing indifferent, it may be two or three or ten of our Brethren think it so too, and for *uniformity* desire we would do it, possibly twenty, thirty, fourty others of our people, whom vve see walking close with God; they think it unlawful, and vvith tears beseech us not to do it. They are not *humorously* offended, but they tell us, why they think it unlawful; They cannot bring their hearts up to be equally affected with a read prayer, as with one spoken from the immediate dictates of the heart; they cannot think it lawful for us to use Modes of worship, formerly used in an idolatrous service; they cannot judge it lawful for the Magistrate to command any part (in a thing indifferent; in the vvorship of God) which manifestly is scandalous to any considerable number of sober Christians; they think the Law of God concerning scandalizing the weak, concerns Magistrates, as vvell as others; and that it is of the same nature with any other Moral Law, not to be superseded by any humane power. VVhat shall we do in this case? Doubtless in all reason if it appear to us but indifferent, we are bound to abstain by vertue of the command of God. And our Brethren, who would have us do the thing, (if they acknowledge the thing indifferent) must yield to their weaker Brethren, who are tied up from yielding to them, because they think the thing unlawful.

14. The sum is this, God hath commanded us (in things as to their own nature, indifferent relating to his worship) to do nothing by which our Brother may be grieved, stumbled, or made weak. The matter for the omission of which, the Bishop of Exeter so severely censureth us, is a thing in its own nature (at best) but indifferent; we plainly see, that should we hearken to our Diocesan, diverse for whom (our consciences tell us) Christ died, would be stumbled, offended, and made weak. VVe conceive, that the Law of Scandal concerns the Magistrate, as vvell as the Subject: And therefore supposing a command in that case (which

Rom. 14. 21.

yet

yet we see not) vve humbly conceive our selves obliged not to disobey the Commands of the great God of Heaven and Earth. *Aquinas* saith, that *Propter scandalum etiam bona spiritualia, sunt pro tempore, occultanda vel differenda.* And *Hierom.* of old determined, *Dimittenda propter scandalum omne quod potest praetermitti saluâ triplici Veritate Vrae, Justitiae, Doctrinae.*

15. We conclude, that we judge our Brethren very uneven in their censuring of us for disobedience to *Laws*, in this case of the *Common-prayer*, when they do the same thing themselves, for which they so charge us, singing *Anthemes* and *Songs*, &c. and using *Rites* and *Forms* of Prayer in *Cathedrals*, expressly contrary to the Statute, 1 *Eliz.* 2. and whiles the present *Vice-chan.* of *Cambridge*, without any Law of England, or Statute of the *University*, or *Canon*, or any colour of Law, and expressly contrary to his *Majesties Declaration*, and contrary to all conscience and reason, could dispense with his conscience, in usurping an arbitrary power, to the open prejudice of so many of His *Majesties Subjects*, in their children, to stop fifty commencers from commencing, because at 24. hours warning they could not find in their consciences to subscribe to the lawfulness of the *Common-prayer*, and the book of *Consecration*, and to the 39. *Articles*, which none can with a good conscience subscribe, but he who hath distinctly read over the *Book of Common-prayer*, and the *Book of Consecration*, who hath distinctly read over both the *Books of Homilies*, and is well studied in the point of *Ceremonies*, (how else shall he own art. 34.) and in the controverſie of *Church Government*, v. art. 36. yea and indeed in the whole *body of Divinity*; which none can presume of boyes of 18. and 19. years of age, nay how many *Bachelours* and *Drs.* in *Divinity* never read them?) yet all these must the *Questionists* subscribe, and be forced to it by the arbitrary power of the *Vice-chancellor*, expressly contrary to His *Majesties Declaration*, (what Authority he hath since procured as to the future, and by what acts we know not, but we are sure, when he did this, he had no such.) Yet Godly Ministers that dare not read the *Liturgie*, must be by these men, whispered; as the onely men that are disobedient to the *Law*; and upon that account giving just scandal to *Magistrates*, and opposing their *Authority*. But there is a God that judgeth the *Earth*, to whose decision we humbly leave this matter in question, singing the 43. *Psalm*.

F I N I S.